

FACTOR 3

THE DIMENSIONALITY OF NATIONS PROJECT

RESEARCH REPORT

FACTOR 2

FACTOR 1

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII



Reproduced by
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
Springfield, Va. 22151

AD 723825

87

**BEST
AVAILABLE COPY**

**The Dimensionality of Nations Project
Department of Political Science
University of Hawaii**

RESEARCH REPORT NO. 54

**AN EXAMINATION OF VOTING PATTERNS IN THE
23RD AND 24TH SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.**

Jack E. Vincent

MARCH 1971

**Prepared in connection with the Advanced Research Projects Agency,
ARPA Order No. 1063 and monitored by the Office of Naval Research,
Contract No. N00014-67-A-0387-0003.**

**This document has been approved for public release and sale; its
distribution is unlimited and reproduction in whole or in part is
permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.**

BLANK PAGE

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R & D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)		2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	
THE DIMENSIONALITY OF NATIONS PROJECT		UNCLASSIFIED	
		2b. GROUP	
3. REPORT TITLE			
AN EXAMINATION OF VOTING PATTERNS IN THE 23RD AND 24TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.			
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)			
Research Report No. 54			
5. AUTHOR(S) (First name, middle initial, last name)			
Jack E. Vincent			
6. REPORT DATE		7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES	7b. NO. OF REFS
March 1971		83	
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.		9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
ARPA N00014-67-A-0387-0003		RESEARCH REPORT NO. 54	
b. PROJECT NO.			
c.		9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)	
d.			
10. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT			
This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited and reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.			
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY	
2500 CAMPUS ROAD HONOLULU, HAWAII 96822		ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY WASHINGTON, D.C.	
13. ABSTRACT			
<p>The study (1) ascertains scale values for United Nations members on a large number of heterogenous variables (national attribute data); (2) correlates the obtained scale values with general assembly voting pattern data (23rd and 24th Sessions); (3) draws conclusions and generalizations from the observed relationships, and (4) discusses the relationship of the findings to previous research and to certain theories of international behavior.</p> <p>The three most important predictors of General Assembly voting were found to be "Economic Development," "Democracy" and "U.S. Relations." Economically developed states were almost consistently "against the majority," when significant correlations emerged on the issues, while "Democracy" and "U.S. Relations" were "with" the majority on some issues and "opposed" on others.</p> <p>The techniques of analysis included Spearman's <u>Rho</u> factor analysis, and canonical correlation.</p>			

14

KEY WORDS

LINK A

LINK B

LINK C

ROLE

WT

ROLE

WT

ROLE

WT

UN
 General Assembly
 Factor Analysis
 Social Field Theory
 Attribute Theory
 Canonical Correlation
 Voting Patterns

AN EXAMINATION OF VOTING PATTERNS IN THE 23RD AND 24TH SESSIONS
OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.¹

Jack E. Vincent

INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of this study is to relate a large number of variables, pertaining to the national attributes² of the members of the United Nations, to their voting patterns in the 23rd (1968) and 24th (1969) sessions of the General Assembly. This effort may be viewed as a continuation of an earlier one entitled, "Predicting Voting Patterns in the General Assembly,"³ based on 1961 and 1963 data.⁴

Such studies may have importance to notions developed under the titles of Social Field and Attribute Theory. More will be said on these implications shortly.

In the previous study, mentioned above, "Economic Development,"⁵ "Democracy," and "U.S. Relations" were found to have primary predictive relevance to voting behavior. It seems reasonable, therefore, to see if these variables retain their importance for different data.

As a broad overview, then, the study will (1) ascertain scale values for United Nations members on a large number of heterogeneous variables (national attribute data), (2) correlate the obtained scale values with General Assembly voting pattern data, and (3) draw conclusions and generalizations from the observed relationships and discuss their applicability to previous research and to certain theories of international behavior.⁶

Regarding theoretical implications, the primary features of Social Field Theory, developed primarily by Rudolph J. Rummel, are given by the

following statements: (1) "international relations is a field consisting of all the attributes and interactions of nations and their complex inter-relationships" (2) "the international field can be analytically divided into attribute, A, and behavior, B, spaces in which attributes and interactions are projected, respectively, as vectors" (3) "the attribute and behavioral spaces are generated by a finite set of linearly independent dimensions" (4) "nations are located as vectors in attribute space and coupled into dyads in behavior space" (5) "the distance vectors in A-space that connect nations are social forces determining the location of dyads in B-space" (6) "the direction and velocity of movement over time of a dyad in B-space is along the resolution vector of the forces, d," and (7) "B-space in a sub-space of A-space." ⁷

Applications of the model have, typically, involved the factor analysis of attribute measures and then, separately, behavior measures. The predicted relationship between the resulting dimensions are then tested by correlation techniques. In this connection, two models or equations have been developed. The first, Model I, is expressed as

$$w_{i \rightarrow j, k} = \sum_{l=1}^p \alpha_l d_{i-j, l}$$

where $w_{i \rightarrow j, k}$ is the behavior of nation i to nation j on the k^{th} dimension of behavior space, d is the distance vector between i and j on the l^{th} dimension of the p-dimensional space of nation attributes, and α_l is the corresponding parameter. ⁸

This equation may be understood as saying that if we select any particular behavioral dimension, we may explain the behavior on it by summing the weighted attribute dimensions expressed in terms of distance

vectors. Distance vectors, in this connection, are calculated using the factor score differences on a particular attribute dimension. To put the whole matter in other terms, the differences between nations in respect to their attributes determine their behavioral relationships to one another.

The second equation, Model II, is expressed as⁹

$$w_{i+j,k} = \sum_{l=1}^p \alpha_l d_{i-j,l}$$

The primary difference between the two equations is that parameter weights are allowed to vary for each actor i , in respect to the distance vectors, in attempting to account for the dyadic behavior. Thus, a fundamental factor dimension, such as "Economic Development," may be weighted one way for Albania but a different way for Afghanistan in attempting to account for some behavior, such as their exports.

Rummel has compared and contrasted these two fundamental equations of Social Field Theory with that of Attribute Theory, the latter expressed by the equation

$$w_{ik} = \sum_{l=1}^p \beta_l s_{il}$$

where w_{ik} is the total behavior of nation i on the k^{th} behavioral dimension, s_{il} is the l^{th} attribute dimension of the p -dimensional space of nation attributes, and β_l the corresponding parameters.¹⁰

Rummel has demonstrated that the parameters α_l of Model I of Social Field Theory and β_l of Attribute Theory are mathematically interrelated, that is, $\alpha_l = \frac{\beta_l}{N}$.¹¹ In other words, the weights given to the attribute dimensions in Attribute Theory can be used to predict the weights of the

distance vectors of Social Field Theory, Model I. Thus, if 10 states are treated in Attribute Theory, and the weight given to the "Economic Development" dimension is 7, in predicting some behavior dimension, the weight for the "Economic Development" distance vector would be .7 in Social Field Theory, Model I, with the same data.

Rummel further demonstrates that there is no similar simple mathematical relationship between the weights of Model II and Attribute Theory.

Unfortunately, the relationship described by Rummel only holds where the total behavior referred to, in connection with Attribute Theory, represents a summation of individual dyadic behaviors to arrive at the total behavior. That is, if the behavior dimension in question concerns total exports, then the total export figure for the particular nation would be generated by summing together its exports to all other nations considered.

It should be apparent from subsequent discussion, that the theoretical implications developed from this paper relate better to Attribute Theory than to Social Field Theory, in the sense that dyadic relationships are not the focus of attention. Because United Nations voting is not dyadic in form, but nevertheless, in my opinion, is behavior, this work, although closely related to Rummel's, falls outside of the realm of Social Field Theory. That is, in discussing behavior, Rummel argues, "Interaction ... is defined as a behavioral act: any action of one nation toward a specific other nation. This action then couples the two nations together. Thus, the exports of Peru to Bolivia is an action coupling the two nations. Two nations so coupled by the actions of one are called a dyad and the action involved is dyadic behavior."¹²

It should be evident that a country like the United States does not generate a dyadic relationship when it votes in the General Assembly as

it does when it sends exports to other countries, such as Japan or Indonesia.¹³ This raises a question as to whether some important behavior in the international system is not dyadic in form and therefore not susceptible to treatment within the framework of Social Field Theory. However, if one ignores the constraint that total behavior in Attribute Theory should represent a summation of discrete dyadic acts, then, clearly, the present work can be viewed as guided by Attribute Theory. Because behavior, in this latter sense, is not a summation of discrete dyadic acts, it is no longer possible to deduce the Model I parameters from any findings, however, because the behavior, that is, United Nations voting, is not assumed to have a dyadic form. Nevertheless, at the most general level, that is, in respect to the notion that attributes and behavior are linked, this project and the previous one can be viewed as complementary to Social Field Theory.

THE RESEARCH DESIGN

Attribute Measures

The attribute measures, viewed as independent variables, were selected because of their prior use in the study mentioned above. They were originally selected because they cut across numerous economic, social, political, and geographic features of United Nations members. Two sources are primary. These are the Cross Polity Survey and the World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators.¹⁴ That is, the bulk of the variables was drawn from these well-known and carefully compiled resources. Appendix A gives the list of the variables selected and their sources.

Voting Measures

Data for the voting measures were taken from the records of the General Assembly. Appendix B lists the resolutions by their title and number and gives a summary abstract of each resolution. Resolutions were assigned scores following the procedures of Alker and Russett,¹⁵ that is, "No" was assigned 1, 'Abstain' 2, and "Yes" 3. In cases of absenteeism, where the vote intended is not known, states were assigned the mean value of those states which voted.¹⁶ Certain states whose absenteeism was considered too high (more than 50%) were dropped.¹⁷

Data Transformation

Because many of the variables selected are basically ordinal in nature and others may have badly skewed distributions, it was decided to assign rank numbers to the original scores. Thus, the ascertainable universe of states were assigned rank numbers on each of the variables selected. For example, 128 states can be scaled on the variable of Dollar Exports to the United States. The rank numbers, then, range from 1 to 128 on this variable. In cases of ties, states showing the same value were assigned average ranks. Missing values were estimated by regression techniques¹⁸ in the case of the attribute data and then standardized. In the case of the voting data, absenteeism was handled, as explained above, by assigning mean values, after standardization.

Methods

Three methods can be considered primary. These are: Spearman's Rho, factor analysis, and canonical correlation.

All correlations other than the canonical correlations are Spearman's Rho.¹⁹ This statistic, unlike the Pearson r coefficient, does not assume interval numbers or normal distributions. In this sense, then, Spearman's Rho is conservative in that the only assumption about a scale value made is that it indicates more. Because the *N* of this study is 116, significant correlations are produced if they reached the magnitude of $\pm .25$ at the .01 level.²⁰

Factor analysis, as a useful technique, is now fairly well known.²¹ Elsewhere I have distinguished between the use of factor analysis as a search for causes and its usefulness for data reduction.²² Its latter use alone is employed in this project. Such usage enables the investigator to reduce a larger number of correlated variables to a smaller set of uncorrelated variables, called factors. Factor scores which represent the factor dimensions then correlate with the original variables exactly to the extent the variables load on the dimensions. This kind of application of factor analysis should become clear, if not already, in subsequent discussions.

Canonical correlation²³ may be viewed as a special kind of two-way multiple regression analysis. Its primary value is in showing what is important from a predictive point of view when one set of variables is used to predict another set of variables. Subjects can be given canonical variate scores in the application of such procedures and these scores have certain useful properties. Such scores can be computed by the formula, $C = SW$, where *C* is an $N \times 1$ vector of canonical variate scores, *S* is an $N \times$ matrix of the subject's standard scores on the original variables, and *W* is an $n \times 1$ vector of canonical weights, where N = subjects, and n = variables.

This formula is given here to make clear the meaning of canonical variate scores. The actual calculation of the weights is the solution to the basic canonical problem which is to maximally correlate two sets of scores, one generated from one set of variables and the other generated from the other set. When weights are calculated so that this is the case, the canonical variate scores predict the original variables to the extent of their canonical loadings if the original variables are mutually orthogonal in each set. This, of course, will be the case when employing factor scores as original variables. As in the case of factor analysis, the meaning and uses of this technique should become clear through actual application.

Procedurally, the national attribute data will be reduced to a set of factor scores. These factor scores will then be related to the individual votes of the 23rd and 24th sessions. A factor analysis of the combined voting data²⁴ will then follow and the attribute factor scores will be related to the voting factor scores by simple, and then, canonical correlation.

THE RESULTS

Factor Analysis of National Attribute Data

The national attribute data was factor analyzed using the principal component solution, with unities in the principal diagonal of the correlation matrix. The principal components were computed out to 1.0 eigenvalue and Kaiser's varimax criterion was used for rotation. The following table shows the resulting loadings matrix:

TABLE 1

The row square sums indicate the percentage of variation in a variable accounted for by all of the factors taken collectively. For example, the first variable, Large Percentage of Military Personnel as a Percentage of Total Population, has 89% of its variance accounted for by the 13 factors. It can be seen that a majority of the variance of each variable is accounted for by the 13 factors, although some variables are better accounted for than others. In this connection, those variables with a smaller percentage of variance explained do not tend to correlate very well with the other variables in the analysis. It would be possible to account for all of the variance in each variable by computing out to .00 eigenvalue or larger in the factor solution.²⁵ Most researchers prefer, however, to give up some of the variance by cutting off at the 1.0 eigenvalue level rather than face as many factors, or, possibly, nearly as many factors, as original variables. It can be seen that the factor analysis has been fairly successful in reducing a large number of variables to a considerably smaller number with a relatively small loss of information. The exact amount of information given up is 21%, in the sense that all of the factors collectively can account for 79% of the total original variance.

The column square sums reveal the predictive importance of the factors in terms of the number of units of variance accounted for, out of the original 77 variables. For example, the first factor accounts for 16.27 units of variance out of the 77 units of variance, or approximately 21% of all of the variance.

The following table "interprets" the above matrix, focusing on loadings $\pm .50$ or above.

TABLE 2

Factors are named in terms of the characteristics of those with high factor scores. For example, on the first factor dimension, those with high factor scores tend to be "developed" in the sense that they tend to have many radios per 1,000 population, a large percentage literate of population aged 15 and over, few inhabitants per physician, high newspaper circulation per 1,000 population, and so forth.

Although numerous warnings have been given concerning the use of factor names, some investigators, I fear, still misunderstand the process of naming factors, using the techniques employed here. Factor names are simply convenient handles. They do not, and usually cannot, fully describe all of the heavily loading variables. The important thing to remember is that a factor dimension has predictive power in respect to all of the variables. Those variables predicted best by a particular factor are simply grouped together for convenience. Thus, the set of factor scores referred to as "Economic Development" can account for approximately $.39^2$ or 79% of the variance of the variable, Many Radios per 1,000 population, $.88^2$ or 77% of the variance of the variable, Large Number of Inhabitants per Physician, and so forth.

States standing low on the dimension, that is, those with small factor scores, of course, tend to have the opposite characteristics from those with high factor scores. For example, on this dimension, Afghanistan has a score of -2.02, Somalia a score of -1.35, and Sierra Leone, -1.47. This indicates that such states and others with low scores tend to have a large number of inhabitants per physician, very low newspaper circulation per 1,000 population, few radios per 1,000 population, and so forth.

The remaining dimensions may be similarly interpreted and have been named Democracy, U.S. Relations, Smallness, Militarism, Population

Dispersion, Instability, Executive Interest Aggregation, Small Population Rate Increase, Religious and Linguistic Heterogeneity, Small Communist China Economic Relations, Low Voting Intensity, and Unitarism.

These results are, of course, highly similar to those obtained previously in the voting study referred to above. There are some differences, here, however, and these may be accounted for by (1) a larger N in this study, and (2) the decision to estimate missing values through regression techniques rather than assigning mean estimates.

The net result is a somewhat simpler factor structure. The previous study evidenced 14 factors, while this study shows 13. Most of the factor names and loadings, however, are highly similar. For example, in the previous study, Many Radios per 1,000 Population loaded .88 on the Economic Development factor, while in this study, it loads .89. Large Number of Inhabitants per Physician loads -.88 in both studies. Very Low Per Capita Gross National Product loaded -.86 in the previous study and -.84 in this study, etc.

To summarize, the 77 original predictor variables have been reduced to 13 variables whose relationship to the original variables is given by the factor loadings. Because factor scores using these techniques are uncorrelated, they possess certain advantages over the original variable scores, and these advantages will be revealed in subsequent analysis.

Relationship of National Attribute Factor Scores to the 23rd Session Voting Scores

The following table shows the relationship between the national attribute factor scores and the voting scores of the 23rd session.

TABLE 3

The results can be assessed in two ways. First, in terms of the importance of relationships, both for the predictors and the votes, and secondly, in terms of the "direction" of the relationships, a point to be taken up shortly.

Ignoring the problem of statistical significance for a moment, and simply directing ourselves to the question of variance explained from a descriptive standpoint, a great deal of information is given on the votes by the row square sum figures. For example, Admit China (Use Charter) has a row square sum of .49. This indicates that 49% of the variance in that vote can be accounted for by all of the predictors taken collectively. This interpretation can be made because each predictor is uncorrelated with every other predictor, thus allowing one to add the squares of the correlation coefficients to arrive at an aggregate "variance explained" figure. It can be seen that a considerable portion of the variance is accounted for in the majority of the votes by these predictors. Only the votes of Urge Bi-Lateral Discussion on Limited Nuclear Weapons, IFNI-Spanish Sahara Independence, Strengthen Educational Programs, and Increase Language Requirements of Staff have less than 25% of the variance accounted for.

The table also gives a rough impression of the importance of the predictors in descriptive terms given by the column square sums. For example, Economic Development has a column square sum of 2.32. These figures may be viewed as the aggregate variance accounted for by the predictors, realizing that there is overlapping variance in the votes. Economic Development, Democracy, U.S. Relations, and Instability emerge as the most important predictors from a descriptive point of view. This

accords well with the results of the previous project, where Economic Development, Democracy, and U.S. Relations were shown to have primary predictive importance.

The predictors can also be graded as to the number of significant correlations produced. The following table gives the results:

TABLE 4

These results, naturally, complement those treated above concerning raw aggregate variance. In this latter case we simply list the number of significant correlations regardless of their magnitude which, of course, has a bearing upon the aggregate variance explained. It can be seen, for example, that U.S. Relations from a descriptive point of view has a larger aggregate variance explained figure (1.43) than Instability (1.00). Nevertheless, Instability generates more significant correlations than U.S. Relations.

In respect to this analysis, given the magnitude of this matrix and the decision to operate at the .01 level, we would expect only 4.25 significant correlations to occur by chance in such a matrix. It can be seen that the actual number far exceeds chance expectations.

Above it was hinted that the direction of prediction may be an important focus of concern along with the aggregate variance explained and number of significant correlations produced. In the previous project, to get at this question, a panel of judges was asked whether, in their opinion, voting for the resolutions treated in the project indicated a tendency to bolster the interests and development of the United Nations

(positive tendency) or shows an opposite (negative tendency). The judges were also given an opportunity to indicate if they felt that a particular resolution was basically irrelevant to such tendencies. It was decided to employ the same procedures in this project.²⁶ After they were employed, it was discovered that there was virtually perfect consistency between the judges' assessments as to what constitutes positive orientations and the actual majority votes in the General Assembly on the resolutions.

In the case of the 23rd Session, there were only three exceptions. These concerned Termination of Colonial Status of Gibraltar, Russian as a Working Language in the UN, and Increasing the Language Requirements of the Staff, where a "yes" vote was viewed as "neutral" instead of something bolstering the interests and the development of the United Nations, as in the case of the other votes.

In view of these findings, it was decided to change the approach somewhat and ascertain the relevancy of the predictors in terms of being with or against the majority vote. This shift has the advantage of changing the focus from the somewhat abstract notion of general UN interests, as determined by the judges, to ascertaining the predictors of agreement or disagreement with the majority vote, recognizing that, in the judges' view, voting "yes" for the vast majority of the resolutions is tantamount to furthering UN interests, i.e., evidences a "positive tendency."

Before proceeding along these lines, however, it might prove useful to indicate the best predictors of each of the votes in terms of the highest significant correlation. This will then set the stage for assessing who (in terms of national attributes) is for or against the majority, counting both highest significant correlations and total significant correlations. The following table shows the results regarding highest significant correlations.

TABLE 5

It can be seen that when the focus of attention is the highest significant correlations, instead of the raw number of correlations, that only three predictors, Economic Development, Democracy, and U.S. Relations, are listed, with two exceptions, Executive Interest Aggregation and Voting Intensity. In the above table, to facilitate interpretation, the characteristics of those voting for the resolution are given, instead of the factor name.

Combining these results with those of Table 3, and ascertaining now whether those with high factor scores are with or against the majority, we get the following results:

TABLE 6

Looking first at the analysis concerning the highest significant correlations, it can be seen that only one factor evidences consistency as given in the net figure, and this is Economic Development. Thus, Economic Development, in terms of its highest significant correlations, is never "with" the majority but is 8 times against it. This leaves a net figure of 3 times against. Democracy, on the other hand, is with the majority 4 times, but against it 5 times, leaving a net figure of 1 against. U.S. Relations shows a highly similar pattern of 2 with and 2 against, leaving a net of 0. These results indicate, then, that if the focus of attention is the highest significant correlations, developed states tend to consistently be against the majority and that no other factor evidences such consistency in the group of predictors treated.

Turning to the total significant correlations, as opposed to the highest significant correlations, we observe a somewhat different result. Again, Economic Development shows perfect consistency and every significant correlation is opposed to the majority. Democracy and U.S. Relations again tend to split the difference, yielding very low net scores. Instability, however, emerges in this analysis as an important consistent predictor with a net score of 8 with. It is interesting to note that Instability, in competition with the other predictors, never generated a highest significant correlation for any vote, but it does pick up a number of modest correlations, all of which are consistently in the "with majority" direction.

These results suggest the following, at least for the 23rd Session. There are three, possibly four, important predictors of UN voting. One of these, Economic Development, evidences large correlations, compared to the other predictors, and consistent correlations, in the sense that all are against the majority. Democracy generates a large number of significant correlations and high correlations, but they tend to split between being "with" and "against" the majority. U.S. Relations generates a smaller number of high and significant correlations and the splitting pattern is similar to that of Democracy. Instability generates no highest correlations but does generate a number of significant correlations, all of which are in the "with majority" category.

It should now prove to be of considerable interest to see if similar results occur using data from the 24th Session.

Relationship of National Attribute Measures
to 24th Session Voting Measures

The following table shows the relationship between the predictors and the votes:

TABLE 7

In terms of gross features, a high similarity in result obtains. Again, the majority of the votes have a sizable proportion of their variance accounted for by the variables taken collectively. Only votes 4, 13, 21, 29, 30, and 32 have less than 25% of their variance accounted for from a descriptive point of view. Again, by examination of the column square sums, we see that the four most important predictors of aggregate variance remain Economic Development, Democracy, U.S. Relations, and Instability.

Of interest here also is the combined aggregate variance score across the two sessions. This is given at the bottom of Table 7. The combined figure shows the same four predictors as being of primary importance from a descriptive point of view.

Table 8 shows the result when the focus is on the sheer number of significant correlations.

TABLE 8

As might be expected, the results are highly similar to those obtained in the similar analysis with the 23rd Session. In fact, the two indexes correlate .95. We would expect 4.29 correlations to occur by chance in a matrix of this magnitude, and thus, again, the obtained results far exceed chance expectations.

An analysis focusing upon the best predictor, in terms of the largest significant correlation of each vote, again generates highly similar results.

TABLE 9

It can be seen that Development, Democracy, and U.S. Relations tend to dominate as predictors.

When the results are tabulated in terms of the "with majority" or "against majority" categories used previously, we obtain:

TABLE 10

A remarkable consistency of result obtain. It can be seen that Economic Development is by far and away the most important predictor, whether in terms of highest significant correlations or total significant correlations, and there is only one deviation from the perfect pattern noted earlier. The other three important predictors, Democracy, U.S. Relations, and Instability, show the same general pattern, with Democracy and U.S. Relations tending to cancel the "with" vs. the "against" category (although Democracy emerges somewhat stronger "against" in the net figure concerning total significant predictions) and Instability showing little importance in respect to the highest significant correlation but a consistent pattern of "with" when total significant correlations are considered.

It may be concluded, then, that the same predictors appear to have primary relevance in both sessions and that the patterns of predicting "with" or "against" the majority exhibit considerable similarity, with Economic Development dominating as a predictor in terms of the number of high significant correlations, total number of correlations, and consistency of direction.

Factor Analysis of Voting Data

Thus far the analysis has focused upon the relationship of the predictor factor dimensions to individual votes. A number of research advantages can also be obtained by factor analyzing the voting data and the relating the voting factor dimensions to the predictor factor dimensions through correlational techniques.

To some, these additional statistical manipulations may appear, at least partially, redundant. The question might be asked, "Why relate the predictor factor dimensions to the voting factor dimensions, when, in using the factor analytic techniques that you do, the voting factor dimensions simply re-express the original voting variance, or at least most of it, in another form? That is, would we not expect the same predictors to have primary relevance?"

The answer to this last question is, basically, "Yes, we would expect a high degree of convergence in respect to results in the sense of assessing which predictors are important."

Why, then, bother to factor analyze the voting data? The answer is, "The factor analysis itself and the clustering of variables that it produces may in itself generate useful insights in respect to the pattern or form of the relationships observed."

In addition, as will be seen, the factor analysis of the voting data sets up the application of canonical correlation techniques and allows an ease of interpretation that would not otherwise obtain.²⁷ For these reasons, then, a factor analysis of the voting data seems a reasonable enterprise. The following table shows the results of the rotated analysis:

TABLE 11

It can be seen that 12 factors are needed to account for the bulk (79%) of the variance in the voting data, using the 1.0 eigenvalue rule to determine the number of factors. An examination of the row square sum shows that the bulk of the variance in most of the votes is accounted for by the 12 factors, although, as might be expected, there is considerable variation in this respect. For example, Vote 8, Study Peaceful Uses of the Sea Bed, only has 53% of its variance accounted for, in contrast to Vote 22, Strengthening Education-Training Program, with 93% of its variance accounted for. Such results, however, are typical of factor analysis applications in the social sciences.

Again, the predictive importance of any particular factor can be assessed by noting the column square sum which indicates the number of units of variance out of the original 58 that are accounted for.

It may also be recalled here that the square of any particular loading gives the variance explained in the original vote on any particular dimension. For example, approximately 70% of the variance of the second vote, Assist Namibia in Independence, can be accounted for by the first factor dimension ($-.34^2 = 70.56$).

As in the case of the attribute dimensions, the loadings can be "interpreted," although it should be re-stressed here that factor names are used simply as useful labels and that the real content of a dimension must be understood in terms of the individual loadings. With these qualifications in mind, the loadings are interpreted in Table 12.²⁸

TABLE 12

In gross terms, the factor analysis **appears** most remarkable in the sense that on each factor, for every heavy loader, a state either tends to vote Yes or against the majority in respect to the votes that are grouped. For example, on the first factor dimension, labeled Colonialism, a state with a high factor score tends to vote No or abstain on each of the votes listed.²⁹ This interpretation results, of course, from the prior decision to name votes in terms of the implications of Yes votes.

It can be seen that there is never a mixture of negative and positive loadings, which, should it occur, would indicate that Yes votes on some issues tend to go with No votes on others. Instead, in every case, as already suggested, high scores predict either Yes or No. An examination of Table 11 shows that the two most important factors are Colonialism, accounting for approximately 21% of the aggregate variance, and International Restraints, accounting for approximately 11% of the variance. In fact, these two factors together, with the third and the fourth collectively, account for more than 50% of all voting variance.

Because each dimension is completely pure in the sense that high factor scores predict either Yes or No votes, but never Yes and No votes, each factor can immediately be categorized in terms of "direction," with naming done, as previously, in terms of the implications of high scores. To simplify matters, the term, positive, will be used to indicate support for the resolutions, and negative, to indicate opposition. This designation is given in parentheses immediately after the factor name.

The analysis can now proceed as before in the sense of interpreting a simple correlation matrix between the predictor factor scores and the voting factor scores. Table 13 shows the results.

TABLE 13

The above matrix shows some highly interesting results. An examination of the row and column square sums shows that there is a strong relationship between the importance of a factor, in terms of the proportion of variance explained in the original variables of the factor analysis that generated it, and its predictive importance in this matrix. Economic Development and Democracy, which were the most important factors on the attribute side, are also the most important predictors in respect to the voting factor scores. Likewise, Colonialism and International Restraints are best predicted.

Because the voting factor scores are mutually orthogonal, it is now permissible to interpret the column square sums directly as a measure of the predictive importance of the factors. That is, 65% of the variance of Colonialism is accounted for, 66% of International Restraints, and so forth. The row square sums show how well the predictors do in accounting for variance. Thus, Economic Development is the best predictor, Democracy the second best predictor, etc.

Although these results are generally supportive of the previous analyses, some predictors which had little significance in respect to individual votes, now assume significance when the focus of attention is voting factor scores. For example, predictors such as Militarism and Small Communist China Economic Relations, show more predictive relevance than might have been expected from previous results. Table 14 should make this clear by listing with each predictor those voting dimensions it predicts, along with their N (negative) or P (positive) character.

TABLE 14

Table 14 is instructive because it helps clarify the negative and positive propensities of Democracy as a predictor. It may be recalled that when individual votes were the focus of concern, Democracy tended to cancel out, in terms of negative and positive tendencies, in respect to its net score. Factor analysis helps reveal the character of these negative vs. positive orientations. Colonial issues tend to evoke a negative response on the part of democratic states, while issues concerning international restraints tend to generate a positive response. In contrast, economically developed states tend to be negative on both major issue clusters.

With the exception of the predictor, U.S. Relations, and its relationship to Red China dimension, the rest of the relationships appear relatively weak compared to those already discussed. An interesting aspect of this analysis is to note that all of the predictors, with the exception of Population Dispersion, Religious and Linguistic Heterogeneity, and Unitarism, show predictive relevance for at least some of the voting dimensions.

Perhaps the best way to reveal the possible combinational patterns in this matrix is through the canonical correlation technique, discussed above. Until now, through the factor analysis, an effort has been made to separate out variable clusters and to express these clusters in terms of a new set of scores, called factor scores. Although such techniques help to show us those variables which tend to cluster together in a category of interest, such as attribute or voting, it does not show us how to combine such elements, that is, the factor scores, in a way to maximize predictive relationships. The great strength of the canonical technique is that it does precisely this. After a prior dissociation into separate components, then, the canonical analysis helps us put

things back together in a way that maximizes predictability, while clarifying matters in respect to overall importance.

Table 15 gives the weights assigned to the variables for the five significant canonical correlations ($P = .01$ or less) generated by the canonical analysis.

TABLE 15

It may be recalled that weights are assigned to the variables to maximize the correlation between the canonical variate scores and that there is no other way of assigning weights to produce a higher correlation than that revealed in the first canonical correlation. The second canonical correlation can be understood in exactly the same terms, only we now deal with variance that is left over, that is, not extracted, by the first set of canonical variate scores, and so on for the third, fourth, and fifth sets of weights.

It can be seen that these correlations are quite high from a predictive standpoint. For example, considering the first canonical correlation, if we are willing to combine the attribute measures according to the set of weights indicated, that is, so that states that are underdeveloped, undemocratic, with far U.S. relations, unstable, and with a high population rate increase tend to be at the top of the list, and their opposites at the bottom, then this list (its scores) will be highly associated with one where those who vote against Colonialism, and for Red China are at the top of a second list and their opposites are at the bottom.³⁰

In terms of the three most important predictors and the weights assigned, there is a high degree of agreement with the previous voting study. In that study, the first canonical correlation assigned the

weights to the first three factors as follows: Economic Development, $-.71$, Democracy, $-.45$, and U.S. Relations, $-.30$. This similarity occurs inspite of certain differences in procedures and a time gap between the two studies.³¹ If all of the weights on common dimensions are considered, they correlate $.89$ with those generated in the previous study, which, it might be recalled was based on 1961, 63 data. This is a remarkable convergence of results.

Table 16 gives the actual canonical variate scores of this first correlation and also gives a good feeling for the meaning of a correlational fit of the magnitude of $.89$.

TABLE 16

There is obviously a good deal of correspondence between the two lists and, further, the clustering of states at the bottom of the attribute list tends to fit well with this researcher's intuitive notions of what kinds of states tend to be developed, democratic, stable, and have strong U.S. Relations. That is, a distinct type of state seems to cluster at the bottom of the list and a basically opposite type at the top. These lists, then, concretize the analysis and demonstrate the considerable power of the factor analytic-canonical approach. In this connection, the predictor canonical variate scores correlate $.90$ with the predictor canonical variate scores of the previous study, for these states in common between the two studies.

To further illustrate the meaningfulness of the lists, we see that the United States should have a high score on the Colonialism factor dimension. In fact, the United States obtained a score of 2.21 on that dimension. Only Finland, with a score of 2.22 , Australia, with a score of 2.23 ,

and the United Kingdom, with a score of 2.34, had higher scores. As for actual votes, the United States voted against or abstained on every one of the 21 votes loading heavily on the Colonialism dimension.

Unfortunately, space does not allow the presentation of all five canonical lists. The ability to reveal types in other lists, however, is clearly evident. For example, in the second list, Undemocratic states with Far U.S. Relations should be at the bottom of the list, and should vote against International Restraints. The 10 states at the bottom of the attribute list, in fact, are UAR, Mongolia, Yugoslavia, Cuba, Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, U.S.S.R., Rumania, and Hungary. Such states should tend to not favor international restraints, but support Red China. The 10 states lowest on the voting list, in fact, are Syria, Cambodia, Rumania, Mongolia, Cuba, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, and the U.S.S.R.

In overall terms, this matrix again supports our view that the most important factors in both analyses have the most predictive relevance. It can be seen that the big factors, such as Economic Development, Democracy, U.S. Relations, Colonialism, and International Restraints, either tend to have an extremely large loading on one of the canonicals or several good-size loadings in the various canonicals. For example, Democracy loads -.43 in the first, .43 in the second, and .57 in the third. International Restraints loads .65 in the second, .46 in the third, and .45 in the fourth. Colonialism has an extremely high loading in the first and a moderate loading in the fifth, while Economic Development loads substantially on the first and the third.

In contrast, the remaining factors either tend to load moderately on only one canonical, modestly on more than one, or hardly load at all.

For example, Instability and Small Communist China Economic Relations both load modestly on three, while Religious and Linguistic Heterogeneity and Unitarism each load modestly on one. Assistance for Palestine Refugees and Increase Language Requirement for Secretariat Staff, on the other hand, hardly load at all on any of the canonicals. This matrix, then, gives us additional evidence of what is important, in terms of predictive relevance, and what isn't. If attention is limited to only the first two canonical correlations, Economic Development, Democracy, and U.S. Relations tend to take first honors as predictors, while Colonialism, International Restraints, and Pro-Red China weigh most on the voting side.

If an index measuring the overall fit of the two sets of factor scores is desired, this is provided by the trace correlation, which in this case, is .54.³²

NOT REPRODUCIBLE

DISCUSSION

Frankly, until quite recently, this researcher has been partially skeptical of his own research products. In order to generate research findings, I have frequently found it necessary to go through a number of statistical manipulations, which, in the opinion of some, may take us too many abstract steps away from "reality." For example, after a presentation of a paper at a professional meeting, dealing with subject matter similar to that reported in this paper, I was accused by one of the members of the audience of simply being interested in "massaging the data." At this point, however, the charge that most of what has been generated out of this and similar studies might be more or less an artifact of the techniques employed, I think, can be put to rest. Some ten years ago, when I was first dealing

with attitudinal information solicited from delegates at the United Nations, I was naturally bothered by the possibility that the delegates might be lying and distorting, and was worried that my questionnaires might be relatively meaningless to them. Since then, however, because of the considerable consistency, regardless of method, of the primary finds in a number of studies, I am now convinced that something important has been revealed by these studies and that this something is perhaps fundamental in understanding the international system.

Before commenting further, I would like to recap briefly these previous studies.³³

TABLE 17

It can be seen that , compared to other predictors, Economic Development measures have emerged again and again as primarily important. Further, concerning the United Nations system, it tends to predict negativism whether one is dealing with attitudes toward specific organs, procedures or voting behavior. It might be wise, then, to attempt to set down in a formal statement the implication of these studies, with a call for possible falsification, in the interests of scientific advancement, by others. The statement can take the following form.

Economic Development is a primary determinant of international behavior. If a large number of variables pertaining to the national attributes of states are factor analyzed, an Economic Development dimension will emerge. If it is related to other measures of international phenomena, it will show superior predictive relevance, compared to other factor

dimensions. If an assessment can be made of the international phenomena of concern in negative-positive terms, as when the content is attitudinal, voting, etc., then High Development will predict negative orientations.³⁴ More concretely, it should predict oppositional behavior, dissatisfaction, static perceptions, and generally non-progressive orientations. Although other predictors will show some predictive relevance, their importance will be considerably less than that of Economic Development. The most important "other" predictions should be Democracy and U.S. Relations, which should also emerge from any cross-section factor analysis of national attribute variables. These variables should predict negative orientations in respect to some phenomenon and positive in respect to others, if such negative-positive assessments can be made.³⁵ All remaining predictors should be of minor consequences. Finally, the importance of the three major predictors, in terms of their relationship to other international phenomena may be expressed as follows: Economic Development, .7, + Democracy, .4, + U.S. Relations, .3, = significant percentage of observed variation in other phenomena.³⁶

These statements are offered, of course, not as truth, but as something that might be used to guide subsequent research designs and interpretations. At a more philosophical level, some Marxists may be shaking their heads and saying, "How dull this boy is, not to recognize from the outset the importance of Economic Development." Should these relationships

hold in subsequent research, however, Marxism seems to provide little elucidation. In fact, the findings so far seem to stand Marx on his head. Following classical Marx' thinking, we would expect the "underdog" to be expressing negative feelings, inclinations, and orientations. Most of the above studies suggest that the opposite may be true. Why it should be true, from an intuitive or philosophical standpoint, appears presently to be elusive at best.

At the same time that one is pleased by finding at least some uniformities in the international system that might lead to a rational re-direction of that system, the findings themselves seem to generate a sense of frustration, at least for this researcher. If Attribute Theory is correct, (as qualified above), that is, that national behavior can be accounted for in terms of national attributes, then such attributes seem to be very difficult to alter and in some cases may even defy any purposive attempts to alter them. Particularly disturbing is the apparent association of Economic Development with negativism, realizing that virtually all national units are attempting to further their economic development. On the other hand, there may be hope for those who wish to manipulate the international system in a way to maximize certain human values, such as avoiding war, by the very fact that sizable portions of the variance in the non-attribute phenomena have not been accounted for regardless of the techniques employed. That is, as much as this researcher views himself as operating within the framework of Attribute Theory, and its possible relevance to Social Field Theory, one cannot help but be impressed by the fact that substantial portions of the variance are simply not being accounted for.³⁷ This may be because an insufficient number of attribute measures have been included in the studies

or it may be that Attribute Theory and Social Field Theory are simply insufficient, in the sense that additional variables, perhaps relating to the psychological components of national actors, must be included as predictors if we are to account for the bulk of observed variation in the IR phenomena of interest. Whether other predictors, should they be necessary, will be any more amenable to rational re-direction than national attributes,³⁸ is a question for the future, but it should be realized that as we gain predictability we may not, at the same time, be gaining tools that will enable us to rationally manipulate the international order in a way to maximize those humanistic or other goals that might be posited in the contemporary world.

NOT REPRODUCIBLE

FOOTNOTES

¹I would like to thank David Davis, John Krupa, Kathleen Dul, and Mary Jo Snyder for their work as coders on the project; Carol Jones and Pauline Kartrude as programmers; and the FAU Research Committee for its support out of NSF monies.

²The phrase, "national attribute data," is used to refer to qualities of national units as determined by some kind of measurement, such as "Large Percentage of Labor Force Employed in Agriculture." In this usage, I view all measures in this study, other than voting measures, as "national attribute" measures.

³Jack E. Vincent, "Predicting Voting Patterns in the General Assembly," American Political Science Review, (forthcoming).

⁴See Hayward R. Alker, Jr., and Bruce M. Russett, World Politics in the General Assembly (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965); and Bruce M. Russett, "Discovering Voting Groups in the United Nations," American Political Science Review, 60 (1966) 327-339.

⁵"Economic Development," etc., refer to "factor names" with specific meaning based on correlation with other variables. This point will be discussed further shortly.

⁶This study, technically, is not a "replication" of the previous study in the sense that the same steps are gone through to see if the same result obtains. Rather, it is an effort to see, in spite of certain differences in procedures, if the "important predictors" of the previous study are also important for this data. The most important differences can be

summarized as: (1) use of a second stage factor analysis in the first study, because of partially redundant factor scores (this point is fully explained in the previous study), (2) use of regression rather than mean estimates for missing data, and (3) use of General Assembly roll call and recorded votes instead of General Assembly and Committee roll call votes (successful Committee votes tend to closely parallel General Assembly votes). The above changes are viewed as "improvements" over the previous procedures, although, as will be seen, a similar result, in fact, obtains.

⁷For a full treatment, see the various Dimensionality of Nations Research Reports, in particular, R. J. Rummel, "The DON Project, A Five-Year Research Program," Research Report No. 9, Dimensionality of Nations Project, University of Hawaii, 1967; R. J. Rummel, "Field Theory and Indicators of International Behavior," Research Report No. 29, Dimensionality of Nations Project, University of Hawaii, 1969; David M. McCormick, "A Field Theory of Dynamic International Processes," Research Report No. 30, Dimensionality of Nations Project, University of Hawaii, 1969; R. J. Rummel, "Field and Attribute Theories of National Behavior: Some Mathematical Interrelationships," Research Report No. 31, Dimensionality of Nations Project, University of Hawaii, 1969; Tong-whan Park, "Asian Conflict in Systematic Perspective: Application of Field Theory (1955 and 1963)," Research Report No. 35, Dimensionality of Nations Project, University of Hawaii, 1969; R. J. Rummel, "Social Time and International Relations," Research Report No. 40, Dimensionality of Nations Project, University of Hawaii, 1970; R. J. Rummel, "U.S. Foreign Relations: Conflict, Cooperation and Attribute Distances," Research Report No. 41, Dimensionality of Nations Project, University of Hawaii, 1970; Richard Van Atta and R. J. Rummel, "Testing Field Theory on the 1963 Behavior Space of Nations," Research Report No. 43, Dimensionality of Nations Project, University of Hawaii, 1970; R. J. Rummel, "Field Theory

and the 1963 Behavior Space of Nations," Research Report No. 44, Dimensionality of Nations Project, University of Hawaii, 1970; Tong-whan Park, "Measuring Dynamic Patterns of Development: The Case of Asia, 1949-1968," Research Report No. 45, Dimensionality of Nations Project, University of Hawaii, 1970; R. J. Rummel, "Indicators of Cross National and International Patterns," The American Political Science Review, 63 (1969) 127-147; R. J. Rummel, "International Pattern and Nation Profile Delineation," in David B. Bobrov and Judah L. Schwartz, Computers and the Policy-Making Community (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968) 154-202; and R. J. Rummel, "Some Attributes and Behavioral Patterns of Nations," Journal of Peace Research, 2 (1967) 196-206.

⁸Rummel, "Field and Attribute Theories of National Behavior ..."
op. cit., p. 6. The above and following brief introduction to Social Field and Attribute Theory also appears in Vincent, "Predicting Voting Patterns ..."
op. cit. Subsequent application should make clear some of the procedural implications of the above statements and the following formulae. Procedurally, the "test" of Attribute Theory is somewhat simpler than Social Field Theory because the latter involves "distance" computations on the attribute dimensions and the determination of dyadic relations on the behavioral variables.

In spirit, however, the two theories are extremely close in the sense that the primary guiding notion of both concerns is "attributes in predicting behavior." However, relations between dyadic partners is stressed in Social Field Theory while relative location (to all states) on attributes is stressed in Attribute Theory.

⁹Ibid., p. 16.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 7.

¹¹Ibid., p. 22.

¹²Rummel, "Field Theory and Indicators of International Behavior,"
op. cit., p. 10.

¹³When Rummel treats UN voting as behavior, he takes the Euclidean distance between the nations on the factor dimensions generated from an analysis of roll call votes. Ibid., p. 26C. Although this may allow treatment of UN voting data for certain purposes, nevertheless, as pointed out above, voting does not appear to be a dyadic in form in the same sense that exports, threats, etc., are.

¹⁴Arthur S. Banks and Robert B. Textor, A Cross Polity Survey (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1963); Bruce M. Russett, et al., World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators (New Haven: Yale University Press), 1964). It is assumed that the factor score location of subjects will not change very much as these resources are updated (not yet available). This is reasonable, particularly on the large factors, which have primary predictive importance in this study, because so many variables load heavily on such dimensions. That is, considerable changes would have to occur on a number of such heavily leading variables to get significant changes in factor score location.

¹⁵Alker and Russett, op. cit., p. 30-31. These procedures do not typically put abstainers in the middle of the voting distributions. As explained by Alker and Russett, "Those abstaining against the pressure of a sizable majority come out closer to the scores of those who said No than they do to those in the affirmative." Alker and Russett, op. cit., p. 31.

¹⁶This places such states in the middle of the voting distributions.

¹⁷These were Albania, Botswana, Gambia and Malta. Ukraine, Byelorussia, Madagascar, Mauritius, South Yemen and Swaziland were also dropped because of inadequate attribute information.

¹⁸A program locates the highest correlating variable on which the missing value subject had information and then estimates the missing value for that variable. Approximately 10% of the data was missing.

¹⁹See Andrew R. Baggaley, Intermediate Correlation Methods (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964) pp. 21-23. The correlations involving factor scores can be considered approximations to Spearman's Rho because the factor scores are not ranked, as the original variables were, prior to using them in correlations, in order to preserve their perfect orthogonality. This facilitates the kind of analysis attempted above. Empirically, I have found ranking factor scores makes little difference in correlation results (compared to unranked factor scores) but does disturb slightly the orthogonal characters of the factor score distributions. To summarize on this point, all correlations that are factored are Spearman's Rho while all correlations using factor scores are Pearson's r, and are viewed, in a somewhat unusual sense, as approximations of Spearman's Rho, in the same way that Spearman's Rho, at times, is viewed as an approximation of Pearson's r. This viewpoint is adopted for the assumption reasons, given above. Also, if factor scores are ranked, the loadings on the dimensions will no longer perfectly reflect the relationship of the original variables to the factor scores (as ranked).

²⁰The .01 level is picked over the .05 level so that, from a descriptive standpoint, the correlations focused upon are larger. In this connection the probability statement assesses the likelihood of getting a correlation of a particular magnitude if we had begun with random numbers in the variables compared. This use of the test of significance is distinct from its use in connection with "sampling variability" where the characteristics of a "universe" are estimated from a sample. That is, from one perspective, we are dealing with a universe in this study and the correlations are descriptive. It is of interest, however, to compare the observed correlation with the probability of getting it if we had started with random numbers.

²¹The uses and meaning of factor analysis will be made clear in subsequent discussion. In addition, see Harry H. Harman, Modern Factor Analysis (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960); Henry R. Kaiser, "The Varimax Criterion for Analytical Rotation in Factor Analysis," Psychometrika, 23 (1958) 187-200; Henry F. Kaiser, "Computer Program for Varimax Rotation in Factor Analysis," Educational and Psychological Measurements, 19 (1959) 413-430; Dean J. Clyde, Elliott M. Cramer, Richard J. Sharin, Multivariate Statistical Programs (Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami, 1966) 15-19; Bruce M. Russett, International Regions in International Integration (Chicago: Rand, McNally, 1968); Rudolph J. Rummel, "Dimensions of Conflict Behavior Within and Between Nations," General Systems, Yearbook for the Advancement of General Systems Theory (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1963); Arthur S. Banks and Phillip M. Gregg, "Grouping Political Systems Through Factor Analysis of A Cross Polity Survey," The American Behavioral Scientist, 9 (1965) 3-6; Phillip M. Gregg and Arthur S.

Banks, "Dimensions of Political Systems: Factor Analysis of A Cross Polity Survey," American Political Science Review, 59 (1965) 602-614; Raymond Tanter, "Dimensions of Conflict Behavior Within and Between Nations, 1958-60," Journal of Conflict Resolution, 10 (1966) 41-64; R. J. Rummel, "Dimensions of Conflict Behavior Within Nations 1946-1959," Journal of Conflict Resolution, 10 (1966) 65-73; Jack E. Vincent, Factor Analysis in International Relations: Interpretation, Problem Areas and an Application (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, forthcoming); R. J. Rummel, Applied Factor Analysis (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970); Jack E. Vincent, "Factor Analysis as a Research Tool in International Relations: Some Problem Areas, Some Suggestions and An Application," Proceedings of the 65th Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (New York, 1969); Raymond B. Cattell, "The Measuring and Strategic Use of Factor Analysis," in Raymond B. Cattell (ed.) Handbook of Multivariate Experimental Psychology (Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co., 1966) 174-243; and Raymond B. Cattell, "The Basis of Recognition and Interpretation of Factors," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 22 (1962) 667-695.

For a discussion of factor scores, see John L. Horn and Wilbur C. Miller, "Evidence on Problems in Estimating Common Factor Scores," Educational and Psychological Measurements, 26 (1966) 617-622; John L. Horn, "An Empirical Comparison of Methods for Estimating Factor Scores," Educational and Psychological Measurements, 25 (1965) 313-331; Gene V. Glass and Thomas O. Maguire, "Abuses of Factor Scores," American Educational Research Journal, 3 (1966) 297-304; and Jack E. Vincent, "Factor Analysis as a Research Tool ..." op. cit.

²² See Jack E. Vincent, Factor Analysis in International Relations ..., op. cit.

²³See: Harold Hotelling, "Relations Between Two Sets of Variates," Biometrika, 28 (1936), 321-377; Harold Hotelling, "The Most Predictable Criterion," Journal of Educational Psychology, 26 (1953), 139-142; T. W. Anderson, An Introduction to Multivariate Statistical Analysis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958), Chapter 12; M.S. Bartlett, "The Statistical Significance of Canonical Correlations," Biometrika, 32 (1941), 29-38; Paul Horst, Generalized Canonical Correlations and Their Applications to Experimental Data (Seattle: University of Washington, 1961, mimeographed); Paul Horst, "Relations Among m Sets of Measures, Psychometrika, 26 (1961), 129-149; M. G. Kendall, A Course in Multivariate Analysis (London: Charles Griffin and Co., 1957), Chapter 5; G. Thompson, "The Maximum Correlation of Two Weighted Batteries," The British Journal of Psychology: Statistical Section, Part I (1947), 27-34; Clyde, Cramer and Sharin, op. cit., pp. 4-8; and Jack E. Vincent, Factor Analysis in International Relations ..., op. cit.

²⁴The 23rd and 24th Sessions were separately factor analyzed and the resulting factor scores related to the attribute predictors. The basic results were not different from the "combined analysis" presented above, which is given because of its simplicity over a separate presentation of each session.

²⁵See Jack E. Vincent, Factor Analysis in International Relations ..., op. cit., on this point.

²⁶The judges were 44 upper division students at Florida Atlantic University who had just completed a course focusing on the United Nations. If the judges' most popular categories (positive, negative or neutral) are viewed as providing the "correct answers" and the judges' responses are then evaluated, Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 shows a reliability of .81 for the "test."

²⁷When the variables that are entered into a canonical correlation are not mutually orthogonal, that is, are correlated, the problems of interpreting the weights are similar to the problems encountered in interpreting weights when using multiple regression analysis. For example, if there are two very good but correlated predictors, the one with the best relationship will receive the heaviest weight and the one with the second best relationship will receive hardly any weight, or, perhaps, an even opposite sign weighting. Weights in the correlated case, then, are no longer correlations of the variables with the canonical variate scores and therefore, interpretation becomes difficult. It should be apparent that one of the primary uses of factor analysis can be to set up data in a form convenient for analysis and interpretation in a canonical correlation.

²⁸The unrotated matrix was also examined and its factor scores correlated with the attribute predictors. No important differences in interpretation were obtained. In fact, the unrotated factor structure, considering the largest factors, was highly similar to the rotated structure, although the latter, as might be expected, was basically "clearer."

²⁹To simplify presentation, hereafter the term, "No," will be used to describe those who are "against the majority," realizing that abstainers tend to be closer to "No" than "Yes" when a large majority supports a resolution, which is typically the case. See footnote 15.

³⁰As in the case of variables loading in a factor loadings matrix, each variable in a canonical analysis, except in the case of a .00 loading, has some "weight." To facilitate interpretation, however, smaller weights are usually ignored in discussion. In this connection,

the square of the weight gives a good measure of its importance. For example, a weight of .70 ($.70^2 = .49$) is roughly four times as important as a weight half its size, i.e., $.35^2 = .12$. The square of a canonical loading, when the variables in the set considered (one side or the other) are orthogonal, is equal to the proportion of variance explained between the variable in question and "its" canonical variate scores.

³¹See footnote 6.

³²The trace correlation may be computed by dividing the number of variables in the set of concern (to provide a basis for an estimate of the variance explained in that set) into each canonical correlation squared, summing, and taking the square root, i.e., $T = \sqrt{\sum \frac{C^2}{V}}$, where T = correlation, C = canonical correlation and V = the set of concern. If each of the two sets of variables are viewed as occupying "vector space," the square of the trace correlation can be viewed as estimating the overlap between the two spaces. The voting set was the "set of concern" in the above correlation.

The trace correlation can easily be misunderstood. It can be quite low even though high and significant canonical correlations are produced. Using the A-space, B-space concepts of Social Field Theory, A-Space and B-Space may not have much in the way of overlap (low trace), even though portions overlapped are highly related. The latter will be reflected in a high or several high canonical correlations. It should be obvious, however, that when $T = 0$, no non-zero canonical correlations can be generated.

³³See: for Study 1, Jack E. Vincent, The Caucusing Groups of the United Nations: An Examination of Their Attitudes Toward the Organization (Stillwater: Oklahoma State University Press, 1965); Study 2, Jack E. Vincent, "National Attributes as Predictors of Delegate Attitudes at the

United Nations," American Political Science Review, 62 (1968) 916-931; Study 3, Jack E. Vincent, "The Convergence of Voting and Attitude Patterns at the United Nations," Journal of Politics, 31 (1969) 952-983; Study 4, Jack E. Vincent, "An Analysis of Caucusing Group Activity at the United Nations," Journal of Peace Research, 2 (1970) 133-150; Study 5, Jack E. Vincent, "An Analysis of Attitude Patterns at the United Nations," Quarterly Journal of the Florida Academy of Sciences, 32 (1969) 185-209 ; Study 6, Jack E. Vincent, Joseph Falardeau, Edward Schwerin, Barry Boseman, and Robert Jednak, "Generating Some Empirically Based Indices for International Alliance and Regional Systems Operating in the Early 1960's," International Studies Quarterly (forthcoming); Study 7, Jack E. Vincent, "Predicting Voting Patterns in the General Assembly," op. cit.

³⁴This statement is included because whenever I have used judges to assess the implications of votes and attitudes toward the United Nations I have found the above to be true. Whether it applies to all aspects of the organization (aspects I have not probed) or other international organization matters is the kind of investigation I would like to stimulate by the above formulation.

³⁵It is possible, of course, that no such assessment can be made.

³⁶This formula is to be viewed as a rough gauge of predictive importance regardless of the techniques employed. For example, in Study 6, the means of the 49 regional groups were compared with the known universe means for all states on the factor dimensions generated from a 74-variable factor analysis. "Economic Development" generated significant differences for over three-fourths of the groups, "Democracy" for over one-third, "U.S. Relations" for slightly less than one-third. The rest of the factors, with one exception, "Population Rate Increase," were less important than "Democracy"

and have not showed the same degree of consistency across studies that is evidenced by the three predictors treated above. Only one predictor, however, "Economic Development" has shown complete consistency, in the sense of always emerging as important (in these studies).

³⁷See the various DON research reports listed in footnote 7. Rummel has had more success, in this regard, with Model II than Model I, but, the testing of Model II, because of the enormous data matrix that it generates (if all states are considered) is presently difficult to deal with. In this connection, Tong-whan Park believes that Model I has more potential than has previously been realized. See Tong-whan Park "The Role of Distance in International Relations: A New Look at the Social Field Theory," a paper presented to the International Studies Association (New Orleans, 1970).

³⁸I have distinguished between national attributes and other variables, such as relating to the psychological make-up of decision makers, which might be viewed as "personal attributes," although the latter can be, with some exercise of the imagination, viewed as "national attribute" data. These kinds of "personal" measures, however, have not, to date, been included in Field Theory treatments.

TABLE 1

ROTATED FACTOR LOADINGS OF 77 PREDICTOR VARIABLES

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
1. LARGE MILITARY PERSONNEL AS A % OF TOTAL POP.	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.10	0.71	-0.00	-0.03	-0.12	0.03	-0.10	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

TABLE 2
INTERPRETATION OF LOADINGS OF PREDICTOR VARIABLES

FACTOR 1

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

13.	MANY RADIOS PER 1000 POPULATION.	0.89
19.	LARGE % LITERATE OF POPULATION AGE 15 AND OVER.	0.84
18.	LARGE % PRIMARY AND SECONDARY STUDENTS AS A % OF POP	0.82
17.	LARGE NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN HIGHER EDUCATI	0.76
56.	NEGLIGIBLE INTEREST ARTICULATION BY NON-ASSOCIATION	0.71
34.	VERY LOW AGRICULTURAL POPULATION.	0.71
10.	LARGE % CHRISTIANS AS A % OF TOTAL POP.	0.69
64.	NEGLIGIBLE LEADERSHIP CHARISMA.	0.52
43.	LATE DATE OF INDEPENDENCE	-0.52
74.	LONG DISTANCE FROM THE U.S.	-0.53
08.	LARGE % MOSLEMS AS A % OF POPULATION.	-0.61
54.	NEGLIGIBLE INTEREST ARTICULATION BY ASSOCIATIONAL G	-0.61
06.	LARGE % OF LAND FORCE EMPLOYED IN AGRICULTURE.	-0.66
45.	PRE-TRANSITIONAL POLITICALLY	-0.68
33.	LOW URBANIZATION.	-0.71
37.	VERY UNDERDEVELOPED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STATUS.	-0.73
70.	TRADITIONAL BUREAUCRACY.	-0.74
05.	LARGE NUMBER OF INHABITANTS PER HOSPITAL BED.	-0.83
44.	NON-WESTERN	-0.83
35.	VERY LOW PER CAPITA GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT.	-0.83
39.	VERY LOW NEWSPAPER CIRCULATION PER 1000 POPULATION.	-0.84
03.	LARGE NUMBER OF INHABITANTS PER PHYSICIAN.	-0.88

Table 2
(continuation)

FACTOR 2

DEMOCRACY

69.	WEAK EXECUTIVE.	0.82
72.	POLICE NOT POLITICALLY SIGNIFICANT.	0.75
55.	LIMITED INTEREST ARTICULATION BY INSTITUTIONAL GROU	0.71
63.	NON-ELITIST POLITICAL LEADERSHIP.	0.66
71.	NEUTRAL MILITARY.	0.60
73.	NON-COMMUNIST BLOC.	0.57
54.	NEGLIGIBLE INTEREST ARTICULATION BY ASSOCIATIONAL G	-0.50
58.	NEGLIGIBLE INTEREST ARTICULATION BY POLITICAL PARTI	-0.69
60.	NEGLIGIBLE INTEREST AGGREGATION BY LEGISLATURE.	-0.74
38.	CENSORSHIP	-0.81
51.	OPPOSITION GROUPS NOT TOLERATED	-0.83
66.	NEGLIGIBLE HORIZONTAL POWER DISTRIBUTION.	-0.83
49.	UNREPRESENTATIVE REGIME.	-0.84
67.	WHOLLY INEFFECTIVE LEGISLATURE.	-0.86
50.	NON-COMPETITIVE ELECTORAL SYSTEM.	-0.86
47.	NO EFFECTIVE CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATIONS.	-0.92

FACTOR 3

U.S. RELATIONS

21.	LARGE % EXPORT OF TOTAL EXPORTS TO U.S.	0.71
22.	LARGE % IMPORTS OF TOTAL IMPORTS FROM U.S.	0.69
27.	LARGE DOLLAR EXPORTS TO THE U.S.	0.52
25.	ALLIED WITH THE U.S.S.R.	-0.69

FACTOR 4

SMALLNESS

32.	SMALL POPULATION.	0.85
36.	VERY LOW INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL STATUS.	0.76
12.	LARGE AREA IN SQUARE KILOMETERS.	-0.50
27.	LARGE DOLLAR EXPORTS TO THE U.S.	-0.52
28.	LARGE DOLLAR EXPORTS TO THE U.S.S.R.	-0.54
26.	LARGE DOLLAR IMPORTS FROM THE U.S.	-0.59
23.	LARGE NUMBER IN PERMANENT MISSIONS AT THE U.N.	-0.67
77.	LARGE NUMBER OF MEN UNDER ARMS	-0.74
04.	LARGE GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT.	-0.79

Table 2
(continuation)

FACTOR 5

MILITARISM

16.	LARGE % MILITARY PERSONNEL AS A % OF POP AGED 15-64	0.77
14.	LARGE DEFENSE EXPENDITURES AS A % OF GNP	0.75
01.	LARGE % MILITARY PERSONNEL AS A % OF TOTAL POP.	0.71
75.	LONG DISTANCE FROM THE U.S.S.R.	-0.52
76.	LONG DISTANCE FROM CHINA.	-0.66

FACTOR 6

POPULATION DISPERSION

12.	LARGE AREA IN SQUARE KILOMETERS.	0.72
02.	LARGE POP. PER 1000 HECTARES OF AGRICULTURAL LAND.	-0.87
11.	LARGE POPULATION PER SQUARE KILOMETER.	-0.87

FACTOR 7

INSTABILITY

48.	UNSTABLE GOVERNMENT.	0.85
61.	UNSTABLE PARTY SYSTEM.	0.81
62.	NEGLEGIBLE PERSONALISSIMO.	-0.68

FACTOR 8

EXECUTIVE INTEREST AGGREGATION

64.	NEGLEGIBLE LEADERSHIP CHARISMA.	-0.53
59.	NEGLEGIBLE INTEREST AGGREGATION BY EXECUTIVE.	-0.86

FACTOR 9

SMALL POPULATION RATE INCREASE

46.	NON-MOBILIZATIONAL SYSTEM STYLE	0.55
07.	LARGE ANNUAL % RATE OF INCREASE IN POP.	-0.57

Table 2
(continuation)

FACTOR 10

RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC HETEROGENEITY

40.	RELIGIOUS HETEROGENEITY	0.76
42.	LINGUISTIC HETEROGENEITY	0.58

FACTOR 11

SMALL COMMUNIST CHINA ECONOMIC RELATIONS

20.	LARGE % LITERATE OF POP. AGE 15 AND OVER, AVERAGE A	0.62
31.	LARGE DOLLAR IMPORTS FROM COMMUNIST CHINA.	-0.69
30.	LARGE DOLLAR EXPORTS TO COMMUNIST CHINA.	-0.74

FACTOR 12

LOW VOTING INTENSITY

15.	MANY VOTES IN NATIONAL ELECTIONS AS A % OF VOTING A	-0.64
-----	---	-------

FACTOR 13

UNITARISM

65.	UNITARISM	0.68
-----	-----------	------

TABLE 3
CORRELATION OF PREDICTOR FACTOR SCORES
WITH 23RD SESSION VOTING SCORES

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1-23 ADMIT CHINA (USE CHARTER)	0.07	0.27	0.45	0.17	-0.02	0.08	0.11	0.02	0.19
2-23 ASSIST NAMIBIA	-0.40	-0.31	-0.05	0.01	-0.10	-0.06	0.31	0.00	-0.26
3-23 ACPT RES OF NON-NUC WEAP ST	-0.27	0.46	0.29	0.01	-0.03	-0.07	0.05	0.05	0.25
4-23 EST NUC FRE-WEAP ZONES	-0.22	0.41	0.31	0.01	-0.01	-0.10	0.07	-0.01	0.18
5-23 RPT ON NUC EXPL FOR PFAC PUR	-0.31	0.21	0.18	0.02	-0.24	-0.08	0.11	-0.18	0.06
6-23 URG BILAT DIS ON LIM NUC WEAP	0.04	0.10	0.01	-0.13	0.10	-0.08	0.05	-0.29	0.13
7-23 CONT UNIF EFF IN KOREA	0.15	0.46	0.49	0.11	-0.06	0.01	0.01	-0.03	0.18
8-23 STUDY PEAC USF SEABED	-0.16	0.33	0.12	0.01	-0.03	0.00	0.06	0.05	0.15
9-23 STUDY EXPLOR SEABED	-0.38	0.32	0.17	0.08	-0.21	-0.03	0.13	-0.02	0.03
10-23 NO STAT LIM FOR WAR CR	-0.40	-0.34	-0.41	-0.01	0.11	-0.09	-0.05	0.26	-0.21
11-23 COMM TO INV ISR PRAC	-0.23	-0.23	-0.45	-0.29	0.21	-0.03	-0.08	0.01	-0.13
12-23 ZIMBABWE INDEP	-0.50	-0.27	-0.24	0.03	0.02	-0.03	0.23	0.12	-0.25
13-23 PORT TERR SELF-DETERM	-0.36	-0.08	-0.26	0.09	0.06	-0.07	0.14	0.08	-0.16
14-23 ACPT RPT ON INDEP OF COLO	-0.44	-0.33	-0.11	0.05	-0.07	-0.09	0.27	0.02	-0.26
15-23 ASK UK IMPL RESOL ON OMAN	-0.26	-0.38	-0.23	0.03	-0.17	-0.01	0.30	0.09	-0.17
16-23 ASKS ADM POWERS TO FND EXPL	-0.47	-0.30	-0.07	0.06	-0.04	-0.10	0.30	0.02	-0.23
17-23 ASKS UN SP AGN TO ASSIST COLO	-0.44	-0.35	-0.12	0.08	-0.01	-0.09	0.20	0.09	-0.28
18-23 GRANT PAPUA INDEP	-0.36	-0.41	-0.23	-0.12	-0.14	0.16	0.32	0.05	-0.14
19-23 IFNI-SP SAHARA INDEP	-0.11	-0.00	-0.18	0.15	0.06	-0.13	0.13	-0.04	-0.05
20-23 TERM COLO STATUS OF GIBR	0.01	-0.48	-0.02	-0.14	-0.06	0.14	0.38	0.04	-0.00
21-23 TERR DETERM FUT STATUS	-0.39	-0.46	-0.06	0.04	-0.04	0.05	0.33	0.04	-0.17
22-23 STRNG EDUC-TRAIN PROG	-0.15	0.08	-0.11	0.05	0.02	-0.01	0.14	0.05	-0.17
23-23 EQUALIZE ASSMT SCALE	-0.29	0.30	0.17	0.12	-0.14	0.01	0.14	0.04	0.13
24-23 RUSS AS WRKG LANG IN UN	-0.26	-0.29	-0.13	-0.17	-0.02	0.09	0.26	-0.10	-0.23
25-23 INC LANG REQ OF STAFF	0.05	-0.00	-0.03	0.16	0.13	0.13	0.00	-0.07	0.04
COLUMN SQ SUM	2.32	2.53	1.43	0.30	0.29	0.17	1.00	0.26	0.80

Continued on Next Page

TABLE 3 - Continuation
Page 2

	10	11	12	13	ROW SQ SUM
1-23 ADMIT CHINA (USE CHARTER)	0.05	0.35	-0.03	-0.05	0.42
2-23 ASSIST NAMIRIA	-0.00	0.22	-0.03	-0.07	0.50
3-23 ACPT RES OF NON-NUC WEAP ST	-0.04	0.03	0.20	-0.05	0.49
4-23 EST NUC FRZ-WEAP ZONES	-0.04	-0.03	0.26	0.00	0.43
5-23 RPT ON NUC EXPL FOR PFAC PUR	-0.12	0.08	0.02	-0.08	0.31
6-23 URG RIAT DIS ON LIM NUC WEAP	0.02	0.16	-0.03	-0.02	0.18
7-23 CONF UNIF EFF IN KOREA	-0.01	0.15	0.00	-0.04	0.55
8-23 STUDY PEAC USE SEABED	-0.01	0.25	0.13	0.06	0.26
9-23 STUDY EXPLOR SEABED	-0.09	0.16	0.08	0.02	0.39
10-23 NO STAT LIM FOR WAR CR	0.11	0.02	0.07	-0.07	0.60
11-23 COMM TO INV ISR PRAC	-0.10	-0.03	0.13	0.05	0.49
12-23 ZIMBABWE INDEF	0.07	0.24	-0.08	-0.05	0.58
13-23 PORT TERR SELF-DETERM	-0.08	0.12	-0.16	0.11	0.33
14-23 ACPT RPT ON INDEF OF COLO	0.02	0.26	-0.05	-0.00	0.54
15-23 ASK UK IMPL RESOL ON OMAN	0.03	0.13	0.02	-0.01	0.44
16-23 ASKS ADM POWERS TO FND EXPL	0.02	0.28	-0.03	0.02	0.55
17-23 ASKS UN SE AGN TO ASSIST COLO	0.18	0.17	-0.02	-0.02	0.53
18-23 GRANT PAPUA INDEF	-0.05	0.14	0.08	-0.09	0.57
19-23 IFNI-SP SAHARA INDEF	-0.06	0.01	-0.16	-0.01	0.14
20-23 TERM COLO STATUS OF GIBR	-0.26	0.21	0.13	0.04	0.55
21-23 TERR DETERM FUT STATUS	-0.04	0.22	0.02	-0.12	0.58
22-23 STRNG EDUC-TRAIN PROG	-0.01	0.01	-0.25	0.00	0.16
23-23 EQUALIZE ASSMT SCALE	-0.12	-0.02	0.24	0.08	0.35
24-23 RUSS AS WRKG LANG IN UN	-0.09	0.07	0.05	0.01	0.35
25-23 INC LANG REQ OF STAFF	-0.06	0.19	0.11	-0.16	0.15
	0.20	0.73	0.38	0.10	

TABLE 3 - Continuation
Page 3

COLUMNS

ATTRIBUTE FACTOR NAMES

1. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
2. DEMOCRACY
3. U.S. RELATIONS
4. SMALLNESS
5. MILITARISM
6. POPULATION DISPERSION
7. INSTABILITY
8. EXECUTIVE INTEREST AGGREGATION
9. SMALL POPULATION RATE INCREASE
10. RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC HETEROGENEITY
11. SMALL COMMUNIST CHINA ECONOMIC RELATIONS
12. LOW VOTING INTENSITY
13. UNITARISM

TABLE 4

NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT CORRELATIONS GENERATED
BY PREDICTORS (23RD SESSION)

ATTRIBUTE FACTOR NAMES

1.	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	14
2.	DEMOCRACY	18
3.	U.S. RELATIONS	7
4.	SMALLNESS	1
5.	MILITARISM	0
6.	POPULATION DISPERSION	0
7.	INSTABILITY	8
8.	EXECUTIVE INTEREST AGGREGATION	2
9.	SMALL POPULATION RATE INCREASE	5
10.	RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC HETEROGENEITY	1
11.	SMALL COMMUNIST CHINA ECONOMIC RELATIONS	3
12.	LOW VOTING INTENSITY	2
13.	UNITARISM	0

TABLE 5

BEST PREDICTORS OF VOTES (23RD SESSION)

1-23 ADMIT CHINA (Use Charter) Close U.S. Relations
2-23 ASSIST NAMIBIA IN INDEP Underdeveloped
3-23 ACPT RES OF NON-NUC WEAP ST Democratic
4-23 EST NUC FRE-WEAP ZONES Democratic
5-23 RPT ON NUC EXPL FOR PEAC PUR Underdeveloped
6-23 URG BILAT DIS ON LIM NUC WEAP Negligible
Executive Interest Aggregation
7-23 CONT UNIF EFF IN KOREA Close U.S. Relations
8-23 STDY PEAC USE SEABED Democratic
9-23 STDY EXPLOR SEABED Underdeveloped
10-23 NO STAT LIM FOR WAR CR Far U.S. Relations
11-23 COMM TO INV ISR PRAC Far U.S. Relations
12-23 ZIMBABWE INDEP Underdeveloped
13-23 PORT TERR SELF-DETERM Underdeveloped
14-23 ACPT RPT ON INDEP OF COLO Underdeveloped
15-23 ASK UK IMPL RESOL ON OMAN Undemocratic
16-23 ASKS ADM POWERS TO END EXPL Underdeveloped
17-23 ASKS UN SP AGN TO ASSIST COLO Underdeveloped
18-23 GRANT PAPUA INDEP Undemocratic
19-23 IFNI-SP SAHARA INDEP No Significant Predictor
20-23 TERM COLO STATUS OF GIBR Undemocratic
21-23 TERR DETERM FUT STATUS Undemocratic
22-23 STRNG EDUC-TRAIN PROG High Voting Intensity
23-23 EQUALIZE ASSMT SCALE Democratic
24-23 RUSS AS WRKG LANG IN UN Undemocratic
25-23 INC LANG REQ OF STAFF No Significant Predictor

TABLE 6
LISTINGS OF SIGNIFICANT PREDICTORS IN TERMS OF BEING WITH OR AGAINST THE
MAJORITY VOTE (24TH SESSION)

ATTRIBUTE FACTOR NAMES	HIGHEST SIGNIFICANT CORRELATION		
	WITH MAJ.	AGAINST MAJ.	NET
1. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	0	13	13 Against
2. DEMOCRACY	3	2	1 With
3. U.S. RELATIONS	3	2	1 With
4. SMALLNESS	0	1	1 Against
5. MILITARISM	0	0	0
6. POPULATION DISPERSION	0	0	0
7. INSTABILITY	1	0	1 With
8. EXECUTIVE INTEREST AGGREGATION	0	0	0
9. SMALL POPULATION RATE INCREASE	1	0	1 With
10. RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC HETEROGENEITY	0	0	0
11. SMALL COMMUNIST CHINA ECONOMIC RELATIONS	1	0	1 With
12. LOW VOTING INTENSITY	0	0	0
13. UNITARISM	0	0	0

ATTRIBUTE FACTOR NAMES	TOTAL SIGNIFICANT CORRELATIONS		
	WITH MAJ.	AGAINST MAJ.	NET
1. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	1	18	17 Against
2. DEMOCRACY	6	11	5 Against
3. U.S. RELATIONS	5	6	1 Against
4. SMALLNESS	0	3	3 Against
5. MILITARISM	0	0	0
6. POPULATION DISPERSION	0	0	0
7. INSTABILITY	9	0	9 With
8. EXECUTIVE INTEREST AGGREGATION	0	1	1 Against
9. SMALL POPULATION RATE INCREASE	1	4	3 Against
10. RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC HETEROGENEITY	0	0	0
11. SMALL COMMUNIST CHINA ECONOMIC RELATIONS	5	0	5 With
12. LOW VOTING INTENSITY	0	1	1 Against
13. UNITARISM	1	0	1 With

TABLE 7
CORRELATION OF PREDICTOR FACTOR SCORES WITH 20TH SESSION VOTING SCORES

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	ROW 50 SUM
1-24 CELB 25 ANNIV UN	-0.39	-0.13	-0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.18	0.20	-0.01	-0.11	-0.07	0.10	0.14	0.03	0.29
2-24 ACHIT CHINA (Use Chartor)	0.13	0.27	0.45	0.17	-0.05	0.06	0.16	0.01	0.14	0.07	0.36	0.02	-0.01	0.52
3-24 ASSIST W NEW GUINEA	0.28	-0.10	0.13	-0.29	0.24	-0.05	-0.08	-0.27	0.01	-0.20	-0.14	0.11	0.26	0.47
4-24 AGNST APAR & COLO IN S AFR	-0.12	0.16	-0.00	-0.05	0.21	0.01	0.18	0.06	0.03	0.01	0.02	-0.20	0.01	0.17
5-24 ANNIV OF GRANT IND	-0.13	0.06	-0.12	0.02	0.04	-0.00	0.14	0.04	-0.16	-0.02	-0.01	-0.24	-0.00	0.15
6-24 CUNT UNIF EFF IN KOREA	0.13	0.44	0.51	0.07	-0.04	0.07	0.01	-0.04	0.13	-0.03	0.12	0.01	0.02	0.51
7-24 STOP EXPLOIT OCEAN FL	-0.39	0.06	0.10	0.22	-0.18	0.05	0.27	0.01	-0.18	-0.01	0.16	0.13	-0.02	0.41
8-24 APP FOR GISEAH	-0.32	0.41	0.26	0.01	0.01	0.04	-0.04	0.08	0.16	-0.00	0.11	0.13	-0.02	0.42
9-24 ENC CHEM-BIO WEAP	-0.32	-0.15	-0.10	-0.01	0.22	0.04	0.16	0.05	-0.04	0.05	0.02	0.07	-0.03	0.40
10-24 PEAC USE ATOMIC ENERGY	-0.34	0.43	0.33	0.02	0.04	0.00	0.12	0.10	0.23	-0.07	0.04	0.24	0.01	0.57
11-24 PEAC NUC EXPLO	-0.06	0.25	0.31	0.14	0.00	-0.01	-0.05	0.01	0.31	0.07	0.10	-0.26	0.13	0.38
12-24 REQ ISR RETURN PAL REF	-0.22	-0.29	-0.46	-0.25	0.22	-0.04	-0.17	0.02	-0.11	-0.13	-0.03	0.16	0.01	0.55
13-24 HUMAN ASSIST FOR PAL REF	0.06	0.10	-0.07	-0.15	-0.09	0.07	0.05	0.06	-0.04	-0.03	-0.05	-0.05	0.06	0.07
14-24 STRENG INDUS DEV BRD	-0.58	-0.01	0.14	0.19	-0.11	-0.09	0.36	0.11	-0.08	-0.17	0.17	0.17	-0.10	0.66
15-24 ISN IMPLMT HUMAN RGTS	-0.34	-0.05	0.16	-0.05	-0.24	-0.00	0.09	0.08	-0.14	-0.05	0.18	0.09	-0.21	0.35
16-24 ISN IMPLMT HUMAN RGTS	-0.18	-0.33	-0.37	-0.24	0.21	-0.03	-0.10	0.01	-0.19	-0.16	-0.03	0.18	0.02	0.49
17-24 CONT COMM ON STATUS OF WOMEN	-0.25	-0.23	0.05	0.08	-0.08	0.08	0.29	-0.06	-0.19	-0.08	0.29	0.12	-0.01	0.37
18-24 ERPC COMMON HUMAN RGTS	-0.04	0.06	-0.09	-0.06	0.13	0.02	0.08	0.02	-0.01	0.07	-0.05	-0.10	0.06	0.06
19-24 COLO SELF-DETERM	-0.44	-0.14	-0.32	0.01	-0.04	-0.01	0.10	-0.03	-0.22	0.17	0.22	0.06	0.01	0.59
20-24 CONS. POST OF COMM HUMAN RGTS	0.07	0.48	0.41	0.03	-0.10	-0.01	-0.02	0.11	0.20	0.05	0.12	-0.13	0.07	0.51
21-24 NAMBIA SELF-DETERM	-0.14	-0.00	-0.13	-0.01	0.03	0.02	0.16	-0.07	-0.10	-0.08	0.12	-0.10	0.04	0.11
22-24 PORT TEHR SELF-DETERM	-0.15	-0.04	-0.26	0.09	0.03	-0.07	0.14	-0.07	-0.23	-0.02	0.14	-0.08	0.16	0.33
23-24 ZIMBABWE INDEP	-0.45	-0.26	-0.14	0.07	0.02	-0.05	0.18	-0.02	-0.23	-0.03	0.29	0.05	-0.01	0.47
24-24 NAMBIA SELF-DETERM	-0.45	-0.26	-0.09	0.01	-0.05	-0.04	0.31	-0.06	-0.25	-0.00	0.30	0.02	-0.06	0.54
25-24 END COLO EXPLOITATION	-0.51	-0.10	-0.20	0.07	-0.07	-0.05	0.25	0.03	-0.33	-0.02	0.21	-0.06	-0.02	0.53
26-24 ASSIST COLO IN INDEP	-0.45	-0.28	-0.20	0.07	0.00	-0.10	0.22	0.03	-0.36	0.01	0.22	-0.00	-0.07	0.62
27-24 INFO ON COLO TEHR	-0.32	-0.10	-0.16	0.11	-0.03	-0.06	0.26	0.10	-0.33	-0.01	0.20	-0.09	-0.00	0.58
28-24 OMAN SELF-DETERM	-0.34	-0.38	-0.30	0.01	-0.10	0.01	0.29	0.09	-0.18	-0.00	0.09	0.03	-0.09	0.50
29-24 GRANT PAPUA INDEP	-0.06	0.09	-0.05	-0.05	-0.03	0.07	0.04	-0.04	-0.21	0.07	0.07	-0.09	0.05	0.09
30-24 SP SAMOA INDEP	-0.23	0.04	-0.11	0.08	-0.10	0.12	0.18	-0.00	-0.16	-0.01	0.09	-0.10	0.08	0.18
31-24 INDEP OF US SAMOA ETC	-0.44	-0.38	-0.22	-0.07	0.14	0.14	0.29	-0.02	-0.07	-0.10	0.25	0.04	-0.08	0.60
32-24 INDEP DE ANTIGUA ETC	0.17	0.04	-0.01	0.16	0.03	-0.09	-0.07	-0.07	-0.11	0.03	0.11	-0.10	-0.00	0.11
33-24 INCREASE UN BUDGET	-0.57	0.17	0.03	0.15	-0.19	0.03	0.38	0.09	-0.08	-0.11	0.19	0.14	-0.04	0.64

COLUMN 50 SUM

3.58 2.20 1.93 0.49 0.48 0.14 1.26 0.19 1.15 0.22 0.91 0.51 0.23

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT CORRELATIONS GENERATED
BY PREDICTORS (24TH SESSION)

ATTRIBUTE FACTORS NAMES

1.	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	19
2.	DEMOCRACY	17
3.	U.S. RELATIONS	12
4.	SMALLNESS	3
5.	MILITARISM	0
6.	POPULATION DISPERSION	0
7.	INSTABILITY	9
8.	EXECUTIVE INTEREST AGGREGATION	1
9.	SMALL POPULATION RATE INCREASE	5
10.	RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC HETEROGENEITY	0
11.	SMALL COMMUNIST CHINA ECONOMIC RELATIONS	5
12.	LOW VOTING INTENSITY	1
13.	UNITARISM	1

TABLE 9

BEST PREDICTORS OF VOTES (24TH SESSION)

- 1-24 CELE 25 ANNIV UN Underdeveloped
- 2-24 ADMIT CHINA (Use Charter) Close U.S. Relations
- 3-24 ASSIST W NEW GUINEA Bigness
- 4-24 AGNST APAR + COLO IN S AFR No Significant Predictor
- 5-24 ANNIV OF GRANT IND No Significant Predictor
- 6-24 CONT UNIF EFF IN KOREA Close U.S. Relations
- 7-24 STOP EXPLOIT OCEAN FL Underdeveloped
- 8-24 APP FOR DISARM Democratic
- 9-24 END CHEM-BIO WEAP Undemocratic
- 10-24 PEAC USE ATOMIC ENERGY Democratic
- 11-24 PEAC NUC EXPLO Close U.S. Relations, Small Population
Rate Increase
- 12-24 REQ ISR RETURN PAL REF Far U.S. Relations
- 13-24 HUMAN ASSIST FOR PAL REF No Significant Predictor
- 14-24 STRENG INDUS DEV BRD Underdeveloped
- 15-24 INTERN CONF ON INDUST DEV Underdeveloped
- 16-24 ISR IMPLMT HUMAN RGTS Far U.S. Relations
- 17-24 CONT COMM OV STATUS OF WOMEN Instability, Small
Communist China Economic Relations
- 18-24 EXPD COMMON HUMAN RGTS No Significant Predictor
- 19-24 COLO SELF-DETERM Underdeveloped
- 20-24 CONS. POST OF COMM HUMAN RGTS Democratic
- 21-24 NAMBIA SELF-DETERM No Significant Predictor
- 22-24 PORT TERR SELF-DETERM Underdeveloped
- 23-24 ZIMBABWE INDEP Underdeveloped
- 24-24 NAMBIA SELF-DETERM Underdeveloped
- 25-24 END COLO EXPLOITATION Underdeveloped
- 26-24 ASSIST COLO IN INDEP Underdeveloped
- 27-24 INFO ON COLO TERR Underdeveloped
- 28-24 OMAN SELF-DETERM Undemocratic
- 29-24 GRANT PAPUA INDEP No Significant Predictor
- 30-24 SP SAHARA INDEP No Significant Predictor
- 31-24 INDEP OF US SAMOA ETC Underdeveloped
- 32-24 INDEP OF ANTIGUA ETC No Significant Predictor
- 33-24 INCREASE UN BUDGET Underdeveloped

TABLE 10

LISTINGS OF SIGNIFICANT PREDICTORS IN TERMS OF BEING WITH OR AGAINST THE
MAJORITY VOTE (23RD SESSION)

HIGHEST SIGNIFICANT CORRELATION

ATTRIBUTE FACTOR NAMES	WITH MAJ.	AGAINST MAJ.	NET
1. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	0	8	8 Against
2. DEMOCRACY	4	5	1 Against
3. U.S. RELATIONS	2	2	0
4. SMALLNESS	0	0	0
5. MILITARISM	0	0	0
6. POPULATION DISPERSION	0	0	0
7. INSTABILITY	0	0	0
8. EXECUTIVE INTEREST AGGREGATION	0	1	1 Against
9. SMALL POPULATION RATE INCREASE	0	0	0
10. RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC HETEROGENEITY	0	0	0
11. SMALL COMMUNIST CHINA ECONOMIC RELATIONS	0	0	0
12. LOW VOTING INTENSITY	0	1	1 Against
13. UNITARISM	0	0	0

TOTAL SIGNIFICANT CORRELATIONS

ATTRIBUTE FACTOR NAMES	WITH MAJ.	AGAINST MAJ.	NET
1. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	0	14	14 Against
2. DEMOCRACY	8	10	2 Against
3. U.S. RELATIONS	4	3	1 With
4. SMALLNESS	0	1	1 Against
5. MILITARISM	0	0	0
6. POPULATION DISPERSION	0	0	0
7. INSTABILITY	8	0	8 With
8. EXECUTIVE INTEREST AGGREGATION	1	1	0
9. SMALL POPULATION RATE INCREASE	1	4	3 Against
10. RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC HETEROGENEITY	0	1	1 Against
11. SMALL COMMUNIST CHINA ECONOMIC RELATIONS	3	0	3 With
12. LOW VOTING INTENSITY	1	1	0
13. UNITARISM	0	0	0

TABLE 11
ROTATED FACTOR LOADINGS OF VOTING SCORES

TABLE 11

ROTATED FACTOR LOADINGS OF VOTING SCORES

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	F9	F10	F11	F12	ROW	SU	SUM
1-23 ADMIT CHINA (Use Charter)	0.05	0.13	0.04	-0.90	-0.04	-0.05	0.05	-0.10	0.02	0.13	0.04	0.05	0.87		
2-23 ASSIST NAMIBIA IN INDEP	-0.04	0.04	0.16	-0.03	0.20	0.15	0.02	0.04	-0.09	-0.04	0.05	-0.19	0.85		
3-23 ACPT RES OF NON-NUC WEAP ST	0.13	0.82	-0.03	-0.25	-0.11	-0.03	0.17	-0.09	-0.04	0.03	-0.09	0.03	0.82		
4-23 EST NUC FREE-WEAP ZONES	0.08	0.74	0.10	-0.18	-0.09	0.07	0.44	-0.06	0.02	0.10	-0.03	0.09	0.82		
5-23 RPT ON NUC EXPL FOR PEAC PUR	-0.17	0.63	0.04	-0.17	-0.06	-0.09	0.17	0.03	-0.08	-0.15	-0.00	-0.48	0.76		
6-23 URG BILAT DIS ON LIM NUC WEAP	-0.02	0.19	0.18	-0.07	0.02	0.16	0.80	-0.02	-0.07	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.74		
7-23 CONT UNIF EFF IN KOREA	0.26	0.29	-0.09	-0.77	-0.17	-0.01	0.01	-0.25	0.00	-0.06	0.05	-0.05	0.85		
8-23 SUDY PEAC USE SEABED	0.03	0.56	0.00	-0.17	-0.04	0.01	-0.01	-0.05	-0.05	-0.09	-0.12	0.40	0.53		
9-23 SUDY EXPLOR SEABED	-0.23	0.73	0.10	-0.12	0.05	0.08	-0.07	-0.09	-0.07	-0.13	0.16	-0.25	0.74		
10-23 NO STAT LIM FOR WAR CR	-0.68	-0.14	0.07	0.14	-0.20	0.09	-0.11	0.18	0.04	0.19	0.06	0.01	0.73		
11-23 COMM TO INV ISR PRAC	-0.25	-0.09	0.01	0.47	0.09	0.05	-0.02	0.73	-0.08	-0.05	0.07	-0.02	0.85		
12-23 ZIMBABWE INDEP	-0.90	0.03	0.05	0.16	0.01	0.12	-0.06	0.10	0.08	0.03	0.05	0.01	0.88		
13-23 PORT TERR SELF-DETERM	-0.60	0.12	0.30	0.20	-0.06	0.13	0.04	0.03	-0.13	-0.43	0.14	0.08	0.76		
14-23 ACPT RPT ON INDEP OF COLO	-0.91	0.01	0.13	-0.02	0.17	0.12	0.03	0.09	-0.11	-0.04	0.05	-0.05	0.91		
15-23 ASK UK IMPL RESOL ON OMAN	-0.65	-0.10	0.11	0.14	0.44	0.17	-0.19	0.14	-0.12	0.12	-0.14	-0.05	0.78		
16-23 ASKS ADM POWERS TO END EXPL	-0.39	0.08	0.13	-0.01	0.13	0.13	0.07	0.96	-0.07	-0.07	0.00	0.01	0.88		
17-23 ASKS UN SP AGN TO ASSIST COLO	-0.94	-0.04	0.08	0.19	0.01	0.08	-0.00	-0.08	0.11	0.02	-0.02	0.01	0.78		
18-23 GRANT PAPUA INDEP	-0.64	-0.05	0.11	0.21	0.53	0.05	-0.05	0.09	-0.06	0.13	-0.12	-0.07	0.80		
19-23 IFNI-SP SAHARA INDEP	-0.13	0.02	0.87	0.05	0.04	-0.17	0.09	0.00	-0.06	-0.11	-0.06	-0.02	0.83		
20-23 TERM COLO STATUS OF GIOR	-0.31	-0.13	-0.01	0.08	0.75	0.01	0.03	0.21	0.08	-0.07	-0.03	-0.09	0.75		
21-23 TERM DETERM FUT STATUS	-0.77	-0.01	0.08	0.09	0.34	-0.03	0.11	-0.05	0.07	0.06	-0.01	-0.14	0.79		
22-23 STRNG EDUC-TRAIN PROG	-0.27	0.02	0.85	-0.05	-0.00	0.26	0.01	-0.01	0.04	0.02	0.24	-0.03	0.93		
23-23 EQUALIZE ASSTN SCALE	0.07	0.75	-0.09	0.02	0.01	-0.07	-0.23	-0.04	-0.00	0.09	0.08	-0.04	0.85		
24-23 RUSS AS WRKG LANG IN UN	0.47	-0.04	-0.04	0.30	0.41	0.13	0.01	0.11	0.30	-0.17	-0.10	-0.07	0.64		
25-23 INC LANG REQ OF STAFF	0.00	-0.04	0.02	-0.04	0.05	-0.01	-0.04	0.04	0.90	0.01	-0.08	-0.01	0.83		
1-24 CELB 25 ANNIV UN	-0.43	0.29	0.03	0.04	0.34	0.05	-0.17	0.36	0.25	0.20	0.07	0.28	0.72		
2-24 ADMIT CHINA (Use Charter)	0.07	0.14	0.03	-0.89	-0.01	-0.04	0.11	-0.19	0.02	0.15	0.03	0.05	0.90		
3-24 ASSIST W NEW GUINEA	0.27	-0.13	-0.14	0.00	0.13	0.04	0.36	0.45	0.20	-0.18	0.16	0.03	0.66		
4-24 AGNST APAR + COLO IN S AFR	-0.24	0.17	0.42	-0.04	0.01	0.67	0.11	-0.03	-0.02	-0.30	-0.12	0.07	0.83		
5-24 ANNIV OF GRANT IND	-0.25	0.02	0.85	-0.03	-0.01	0.27	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.24	-0.03	0.93		
6-24 CONT UNIF EFF IN KOREA	0.29	0.25	-0.10	-0.74	-0.10	-0.02	0.03	-0.21	0.01	-0.10	0.07	-0.07	0.78		
7-24 STOP EXPLOIT OCEAN FL	-0.47	0.52	0.07	0.08	0.21	0.04	-0.19	-0.15	0.26	0.03	0.14	-0.22	0.74		
8-24 APP FOR DISARM	0.04	0.80	0.13	-0.17	-0.07	0.12	0.20	0.03	-0.02	0.03	-0.01	0.02	0.75		
9-24 ENC CHEM-BIO WEAP	-0.46	0.01	0.12	0.16	0.18	0.22	-0.15	0.11	0.02	0.21	-0.00	-0.42	0.69		
10-24 PEAC USE ATOMIC ENERGY	0.06	0.87	-0.06	-0.17	-0.02	0.20	0.10	-0.02	-0.01	-0.09	-0.15	0.09	0.88		
11-24 PEAC NUC EXPL	0.14	0.29	0.13	-0.45	-0.07	0.23	-0.17	0.05	0.08	-0.35	-0.05	-0.01	0.54		
12-24 REQ ISR RETURN PAL REF	-0.25	-0.13	0.03	0.44	0.00	0.09	-0.05	0.76	0.03	0.06	-0.06	-0.06	0.88		
13-24 HUMAN ASSIST FOR PAL REF	-0.08	0.04	0.08	0.06	0.10	0.86	0.05	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.10	-0.03	0.79		
14-24 STRENG INDUS DEV BRQ	-0.04	0.48	-0.07	-0.08	0.08	-0.18	-0.16	-0.05	0.21	0.05	0.03	-0.09	0.77		
15-24 INTERN CONF ON INDUS DEV	-0.33	0.13	0.07	-0.01	0.28	-0.15	-0.14	-0.20	0.11	0.13	0.19	-0.40	0.60		
16-24 ISR IMPLMT HUMAN RGTS	-0.24	-0.13	0.03	0.45	0.17	0.05	0.02	0.75	0.05	-0.02	-0.03	-0.00	0.88		
17-24 CONT COMM ON STATUS OF WOMEN	-0.46	0.07	-0.09	0.10	0.62	-0.00	0.12	-0.19	0.05	0.01	0.28	0.13	0.76		
18-24 EXPO COMMON HUMAN RGTS	-0.14	0.03	0.06	0.02	-0.07	0.85	0.06	0.11	0.00	0.02	0.10	0.03	0.77		
19-24 COLO SELF-DETERM	-0.81	0.00	-0.05	-0.21	-0.02	0.16	0.02	0.14	0.08	0.19	0.03	0.05	0.79		
20-24 CONS POST OF COMM HUMAN RGTS	0.33	0.34	0.06	-0.53	-0.08	0.02	-0.19	-0.26	-0.16	-0.20	0.09	0.07	0.68		
21-24 NAMIBIA SELF-DETERM	-0.19	0.07	0.48	0.11	-0.82	0.15	0.21	0.04	0.03	-0.24	0.23	-0.24	0.73		
22-24 PORT TERR SELF-DETERM	-0.60	0.10	0.27	0.28	-0.03	0.14	0.06	0.01	-0.06	-0.51	0.12	0.08	0.84		
23-24 ZIMBABWE INDEP	-0.86	0.06	0.82	0.18	0.04	-0.03	0.11	0.10	0.10	-0.19	-0.03	0.06	0.86		
24-24 NAMIBIA SELF-DETERM	-0.87	0.08	0.14	0.06	0.21	0.13	0.13	0.07	-0.09	-0.11	0.02	-0.08	0.89		
25-24 END COLO EXPLOITATION	-0.91	-0.02	0.14	0.06	0.02	-0.03	-0.05	0.11	-0.05	-0.10	0.14	-0.04	0.89		
26-24 ASSIST COLO IN INDEP	-0.89	-0.01	0.11	0.15	0.04	-0.01	-0.06	0.08	0.13	-0.03	0.08	-0.04	0.86		
27-24 INFO ON COLO TERR	-0.92	-0.04	0.11	0.03	0.03	-0.02	-0.45	0.04	-0.07	-0.00	0.10	-0.03	0.90		
28-24 OMAN SELF-DETERM	-0.63	-0.11	0.14	0.17	0.50	-0.02	-0.16	0.18	-0.10	0.13	-0.08	0.00	0.81		
29-24 GRANT PAPUA INDEP	-0.09	0.03	0.52	-0.02	0.11	0.24	0.11	0.09	0.03	0.19	0.00	0.16	0.79		
30-24 SP SAHARA INDEP	-0.38	0.04	0.31	0.10	-0.10	-0.10	-0.03	-0.04	0.01	-0.00	0.63	-0.01	0.68		
31-24 INDEP OF US SAMOA ETC	-0.68	-0.03	-0.01	0.05	0.40	-0.07	0.00	0.04	0.08	0.16	0.13	-0.06	0.69		
32-24 INDEP OF ANIGUA ETC	0.05	-0.13	0.09	-0.23	0.04	0.03	-0.01	0.00	-0.13	-0.12	0.72	-0.13	0.65		
33-24 INCREASE UN BUDGET	-0.57	0.61	0.00	-0.01	0.09	-0.01	-0.24	-0.16	0.11	-0.06	0.08	0.01	0.84		

COLUMN SU SUM

35.11 0.11 3.45 4.98 2.70 2.78 1.82 2.63 1.90 1.96 1.92 1.21

TABLE 12
INTERPRETATION OF LOADINGS OF VOTING SCORES

FACTOR 1

COLONIALISM (NEGATIVE)

33-24	INCREASE UN BUDGET	-0.57
22-24	PORT TERR SELF-DETERM	-0.60
13-23	PORT TERR SELF-DETERM	-0.60
28-24	OMAN SELF-DETERM	-0.63
14-24	STRENG INDUS DEV BRD	-0.64
18-23	GRANT PAPUA INDEP	-0.64
15-23	ASK UN IMPL RESOL ON OMAN	-0.65
10-23	NO STAT LIM FOR WAR CR	-0.68
31-24	INDEP OF US SAMOA ETC	-0.68
21-23	TERR DETERM FUT STATUS	-0.77
19-24	COLO SELF-DETERM	-0.81
17-23	ASKS UN SP AGN TO ASSIST COLO	-0.84
2-23	ASSIST NAMBIA IN INDEP	-0.84
23-24	ZIMBABWE INDEP	-0.86
24-24	NAMBIA SELF-DETERM	-0.87
16-23	ASKS ADM POWERS TO END EXPL	-0.89
26-24	ASSIST COLO IN INDEP	-0.89
12-23	ZIMBABWE INDEP	-0.90
25-24	FND COLO EXPLOITATION	-0.90
14-23	ACPT RPT ON INDEP OF COLO	-0.91
27-24	INFO ON COLO TERR	-0.92

FACTOR 2

INTERNATIONAL RESTRAINTS (POSITIVE)

10-24	PEAC USE ATOMIC ENERGY	0.87
3-23	ACPT RES OF NON-NUC WEAP ST	0.82
8-24	APP FOR DISARM	0.80
23-23	EQUALIZE ASSMT SCALE	0.75
4-23	EST NUC FRE-WEAP ZONES	0.74
9-23	STDY EXPLOR SEABED	0.73
5-23	RPT ON NUC EXPL FOR PEAC PUR	0.63
33-24	INCREASE UN BUDGET	0.63
8-23	STDY PEAC USE SEABED	0.56
7-24	STOP EXPLOIT OCEAN FL	0.52

Table 12
(continuation)

FACTOR 3

IFNI AND SPANISH SAHARA INDEPENDENCE (POSITIVE)

19-23	IFNI-SP SAHARA INDEP	0.87
5-24	ANNIV OF GRANT IND	0.85
22-23	STRNG EDUC-TRAIN PROG	0.85
29-24	GRANT PAPUA INDEP	0.52

FACTOR 4

PRO-RED CHINA (NEGATIVE)

20-24	CONS. POST OF COMM HUMAN RGTS	-0.52
6-24	CONT UNIF EFF IN KOREA	-0.74
7-20	CONT UNIF EFF IN KOREA	-0.76
2-24	ADMIT CHINA (Use Charter)	-0.89
1-23	ADMIT CHINA (Use Charter)	-0.90

FACTOR 5

TERMINATE COLONIAL STATUS OF GIBRALTAR (POSITIVE)

20-23	TERM COLO STATUS OF GIBR	0.75
17-24	CONT COMM ON STATUS OF WOMEN	0.61
18-23	GRANT PAPUA INDEP	0.53
28-24	OMAN SELF-DETERM	0.50

FACTOR 6

ASSISTANCE FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES (POSITIVE)

13-24	HUMAN ASSIST FOR PAL REF	0.86
18-24	EXPD COMMON HUMAN RGTS	0.84
4-24	AGNST APAR + COLO IN S AFR	0.67

FACTOR 7

BILATERAL DISCUSSION ON LIMITED NUCLEAR WEAPONS (POSITIVE)

6-23	URG BILAT DIS ON LIM NUC WEAP	0.80
------	-------------------------------	------

Table 12
(continuation)

FACTOR 8

AGAINST ISRAEL PRACTICES (POSITIVE)

12-24	REQ ISR RETURN PAL REF	0.76
16-24	ISR IMPLMT HUMAN RGTS	0.75
11-23	COMM TO INV ISR PRAC	0.73

FACTOR 9

INCREASE LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR SECRETARIAT STAFF (POSITIVE)

25-23	INC LANG REQ OF STAFF	0.90
-------	-----------------------	------

FACTOR 10

AGAINST PORTUGUESE TERRITORY SELF-DETERMINATION (NEGATIVE)

13-23	PORT TERR SELF-DETERM	-0.43
22-24	PORT TERR SELF-DETERM	-0.51

FACTOR 11

INDEPENDENCE FOR VARIOUS TERRITORIES (POSITIVE)

32-24	INDEP OF ANTIGUA ETC	0.72
30-24	SP SAHARA INDEP	0.63
29-24	GRANT PAPUA INDEP	0.60

FACTOR 12

AGAINST REPORT ON NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS (NEGATIVE)

5-23	RPT ON NUC EXPL FOR PEAC PUR	-0.48
------	------------------------------	-------

TABLE 13

CORRELATION OF PREDICTOR FACTOR SCORES

HTL VOTING FACTOR SCORES

ATTRIBUTE FACTOR NAMES	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	<u>0.52</u>	<u>-0.45</u>	-0.03	-0.13	0.06	0.09
2. DEMOCRACY	<u>0.31</u>	<u>0.44</u>	0.10	-0.20	<u>-0.25</u>	0.11
3. U.S. RELATIONS	0.14	0.22	-0.14	<u>-0.47</u>	0.13	-0.03
4. SMALLNESS	-0.11	0.04	0.09	-0.10	-0.12	-0.13
5. MILITARISM	0.04	-0.12	0.05	-0.01	-0.17	0.04
6. POPULATION DISPERSION	0.07	-0.01	-0.02	-0.04	0.22	0.09
7. INSTABILITY	<u>-0.27</u>	0.10	0.08	-0.09	<u>0.38</u>	0.03
8. EXECUTIVE INTEREST AGGREGATION	-0.06	0.05	0.05	0.0	-0.07	0.08
9. SMALL POPULATION RATE INCREASE	<u>0.27</u>	0.15	-0.03	-0.16	0.02	0.06
10. RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC HETEROGENEITY	-0.07	-0.11	-0.02	-0.03	-0.21	0.11
11. SMALL COMMUNIST CHINA ECONOMIC RELATIONS	<u>-0.30</u>	0.04	-0.04	<u>-0.33</u>	0.13	-0.07
12. LOW VOTING INTENSITY	0.02	<u>0.26</u>	<u>-0.25</u>	0.10	0.12	-0.11
13. UNITARISM	0.05	0.0	-0.03	0.01	0.0	0.07
COLUMN SQ SUM						
	0.65	0.58	0.12	0.44	0.42	0.09

TABLE 13 (continuation)

ATTRIBUTE FACTOR NAMES							ROW SQ					
	7	8	9	10	11	12	SUM					
1. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	0.12	-0.10	0.01	-0.09	0.04	-0.03	0.54					
2. DEMOCRACY	-0.06	-0.11	0.0	-0.10	0.11	0.14	0.49					
3. U.S. RELATIONS	0.07	-0.19	0.09	-0.11	0.01	-0.03	0.39					
4. SMALLNESS	-0.19	<u>-0.29</u>	0.12	-0.03	0.05	0.06	0.20					
5. MILITARISM	0.17	<u>0.27</u>	0.14	-0.14	-0.07	<u>0.25</u>	0.26					
6. POPULATION DISPERSION	-0.09	-0.03	0.14	0.09	-0.04	0.07	0.11					
7. INSTABILITY	-0.01	-0.21	0.03	-0.04	-0.05	0.02	0.29					
8. EXECUTIVE INTEREST AGGREGATION	<u>-0.33</u>	-0.03	-0.10	0.15	-0.11	0.12	0.19					
9. SMALL POPULATION RATE INCREASE	0.04	0.03	-0.02	0.02	-0.23	-0.01	0.18					
10. RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC HETEROGENEITY	-0.02	-0.16	-0.07	0.20	-0.03	0.07	0.15					
11. SMALL COMMUNIST CHINA ECONOMIC RELATIONS	0.09	0.0	0.10	-0.05	0.06	0.08	0.25					
12. LOW VOTING INTENSITY	0.12	0.16	0.12	0.19	0.0	0.05	0.26					
13. UNITARISM	-0.02	0.09	-0.11	-0.24	0.10	0.19	0.13					
							COLUMN SQ SUM					
	0.23	0.32	0.11	0.22	0.10	0.16						

TABLE 13
(continuation)

COLUMNS

VOTING FACTOR NAMES

1. COLONIALISM
2. INTERNATIONAL RESTRAINTS
3. IFNI AND SPANISH SAHARA INDEPENDENCE
4. PRO-RED CHINA
5. TERMINATE COLONIAL STATUS OF GIBRALTAR
6. ASSISTANCE FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES
7. BI-LATERAL DISCUSSION ON LIMITED NUCLEAR WEAPONS
8. AGAINST ISRAEL PRACTICES
9. INCREASE LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT FOR SECRETARIAT STAFF
10. AGAINST PORTUGUESE TERRITORY SELF-DETERMINATION
11. INDEPENDENCE FOR VARIOUS TERRITORIES
12. AGAINST REPORT ON NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS

TABLE 14
SIGNIFICANT PREDICTIONS OF ATTRIBUTE FACTOR SCORES WITH VOTING SCORES

ATTRIBUTE FACTOR NAMES	
1.	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT For Colonialism (N) Against International Restraints (N)
2.	DEMOCRACY For Colonialism (N) For International Restraints (P)
3.	U.S. RELATIONS Against Red China (N)
4.	SMALLNESS For Israel Practices (N)
5.	MILITARISM Against Israel Practices (P) Against Report on Nuclear Explosions (N)
6.	POPULATION DISPERSION 0
7.	INSTABILITY Against Colonialism (P) For Terminate Colonial Status of Gibraltar (P)
8.	EXECUTIVE INTEREST AGGREGATION Against Bi-Lateral Discussion on Limited Nuclear Weapons (N)
9.	SMALL POPULATION RATE INCREASE For Colonialism (N)
10.	RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC HETEROGENEITY 0
11.	SMALL COMMUNIST CHINA ECONOMIC RELATIONS Against Colonialism (P) Against Red China (P)
12.	LOW VOTING INTENSITY For International Restraints (P) Against IFNI & Spanish Sahara Independence (N)
13.	UNITARISM 0

TABLE 15

CANONICAL CORRELATION WEIGHTS

ATTRIBUTE FACTOR NAMES		1st (.39)	2nd (.88)	3rd (.74)	4th (.66)	5th (.57)
1.	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	-.65	-.24	-.46	-.28	.06
2.	DEMOCRACY	-.43	.43	.57	.05	-.06
3.	U.S. RELATIONS	-.28	.60	-.26	.02	.00
4.	SMALLNESS	.09	.24	.15	-.43	-.16
5.	MILITARISM	-.17	-.20	.07	.31	-.57
6.	POPULATION DISPERSION	.00	.03	-.19	-.02	.23
7.	INSTABILITY	.31	.33	-.32	-.15	.00
8.	EXECUTIVE INTEREST AGGREGATION	.12	.02	.32	-.26	.20
9.	SMALL POPULATION RATE INCREASE	-.29	.16	.00	.17	.30
10.	RELIGIOUS AND LINGUISTIC HETEROGENEITY	.01	-.06	.18	-.32	.02
11.	SMALL COMMUNIST CHINA ECONOMIC RELATIONS	.19	.33	-.27	.05	-.46
12.	LOW VOTING INTENSITY	.12	.09	-.01	.61	.32
13.	UNITARISM	-.12	-.03	.05	.08	-.34
1.	COLONIALISM (Negative)	-.86	-.08	.01	.09	.39
2.	INTERNATIONAL RESTRAINTS (Positive)	.10	.65	.46	.45	.21
3.	IFNI AND SPANISH SAHARA INDEPENDENCE (Positive)	.02	-.05	.18	-.29	-.18
4.	PRO-RED CHINA (Negative)	.28	-.60	.23	.15	.26
5.	TERMINATE COLONIAL STATUS OF GIBRALTAR (Positive)	.22	.19	-.70	.11	.29
6.	ASSISTANCE FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES (Positive)	-.17	-.05	.80	-.11	.04
7.	BI-LATERAL DISCUSSION ON LIMITED NUCLEAR WEAPONS (Positive)	-.15	-.07	-.32	.42	-.22
8.	AGAINST ISRAEL PRACTICES (Positive)	.04	-.35	.06	.65	-.16
9.	INCREASE LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT FOR SECRETARIAT (Positive)	.00	.14	-.15	.14	-.11
10.	AGAINST PORTUGUESE TERRITORY SELF-DETERMINATION (Negative)	.23	-.07	.10	-.02	.55
11.	INDEPENDENCE FOR VARIOUS TERRITORIES (Positive)	-.01	.04	.01	-.04	-.24
12.	AGAINST REPORT ON NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS (Negative)	-.04	.04	.19	.09	-.38

TABLE 16

CANONICAL CORRELATION SCORES ASSIGNED TO SUBJECTS
FOR CORRELATION OF .89

NATIONAL ATTRIBUTE CANONICAL VARIATE SCORES			VOTING CANONICAL VARIATE SCORES		
87	SUDAN	1.62	35	GHANA	1.30
10	BURMA	1.38	95	UGANDA	1.29
35	GHANA	1.37	108	TANZANIA	1.23
110	KENYA	1.34	11	BURUNDI	1.15
72	PAKISTAN	1.31	2	ALGERIA	1.14
44	INDONESIA	1.30	46	IRAQ	1.08
107	MALAWI	1.28	110	KENYA	1.01
61	MAURITANIA	1.27	61	MAURITANIA	0.93
38	GUINEA	1.26	89	SYRIA	0.92
82	SENEGAL	1.17	44	INDONESIA	0.91
21	CONGO (LEO)	1.14	87	SUDAN	0.86
91	TOGO	1.07	100	UPPER VOLTA	0.86
103	YEMEN	1.06	23	CUBA	0.86
2	ALGERIA	1.06	103	YEMEN	0.85
12	CAMBODIA	0.96	107	MALAWI	0.84
112	GUYANA	0.94	109	ZAMBIA	0.83
26	DAHOMEY	0.94	97	U.A.R.	0.82
106	LESOTHO	0.93	17	CHAD	0.81
109	ZAMBIA	0.93	104	YUGOSLAVIA	0.77
60	MALI	0.91	64	MOROCCO	0.77
83	SIERRA LEONE	0.91	60	MALI	0.76
70	NIGERIA	0.84	13	CAMEROUN	0.75
46	IRAQ	0.84	53	JORDAN	0.73
100	UPPER VOLTA	0.82	93	TUNISIA	0.72
65	NEPAL	0.80	69	NIGER	0.72
55	LEBANON	0.79	105	KUWAIT	0.70
80	RWANDA	0.78	15	CENTRAL AFRICAN REP	0.67
53	JORDAN	0.78	83	SIERRA LEONE	0.67
108	TANZANIA	0.76	43	INDIA	0.66
105	KUWAIT	0.73	72	PAKISTAN	0.63
97	U.A.R.	0.73	20	CONGO (BRA)	0.61
64	MOROCCO	0.70	57	LIBYA	0.60
50	IVORY COAST	0.69	38	GUINEA	0.60
89	SYRIA	0.66	50	IVORY COAST	0.58
95	UGANDA	0.63	91	TOGO	0.57
69	NIGER	0.63	102	VENEZUELA	0.56
13	CAMEROUN	0.62	84	SOMALIA	0.55
15	CENTRAL AFRICAN REP	0.57	1	AFGHANISTAN	0.54
54	LAOS	0.54	16	CEYLON	0.54
93	TUNISIA	0.51	55	LEBANON	0.53
17	CHAD	0.50	31	ETHIOPIA	0.52
63	MONGOLIA	0.47	65	NEPAL	0.51
84	SOMALIA	0.46	81	SAUDI ARABIA	0.49
90	THAILAND	0.46	112	GUYANA	0.47

Table 16
(continuation)

NATIONAL ATTRIBUTE CANONICAL VARIATE SCORES			VOTING CANONICAL VARIATE SCORES		
11	BURUNDI	0.44	63	MONGOLIA	0.47
102	VENEZUELA	0.42	80	RWANDA	0.47
30	EL SALVADOR	0.42	21	CONGO (LEO)	0.46
37	GUATEMALA	0.42	26	DAHOMY	0.45
31	ETHIOPIA	0.40	24	CYPRUS	0.39
34	GABON	0.38	75	PERU	0.39
20	CONGO (BRA)	0.36	10	BURMA	0.38
39	HAITI	0.32	34	GABON	0.38
9	BULGARIA	0.32	18	CHILE	0.35
73	PANAMA	0.31	115	BARBADOS	0.32
40	HONDURAS	0.28	54	LAOS	0.32
79	ROMANIA	0.27	28	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	0.31
1	AFGHANISTAN	0.26	111	SINGAPORE	0.31
116	TAIWAN	0.25	29	ECUADOR	0.30
114	MALDIVE ISLANDS	0.25	12	CAMBODIA	0.24
43	INDIA	0.24	19	COLOMBIA	0.24
81	SAUDI ARABIA	0.23	45	IRAN	0.23
16	CEYLON	0.20	79	ROMANIA	0.22
104	YUGOSLAVIA	0.16	62	MEXICO	0.22
7	BOLIVIA	0.12	9	BULGARIA	0.21
8	BRAZIL	0.09	76	PHILIPPINES	0.20
23	CUBA	0.07	3	ARGENTINA	0.15
45	IRAN	0.04	70	NIGERIA	0.13
74	PARAGUAY	0.04	113	MALAYSIA	0.13
77	POLAND	0.02	48	ISRAEL	0.12
57	LIBYA	0.02	77	POLAND	0.11
59	MALAGASY REP	-0.01	25	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	0.11
76	PHILIPPINES	-0.09	39	HAITI	0.10
68	NICARAGUA	-0.12	41	HUNGARY	0.10
25	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	-0.12	106	LESOTHO	0.10
29	ECUADOR	-0.12	82	SENEGAL	0.05
113	MALAYSIA	-0.16	37	GUATEMALA	0.03
111	SINGAPORE	-0.17	96	U.S.S.R.	0.02
96	U.S.S.R.	-0.18	59	MALAGASY REP	0.02
41	HUNGARY	-0.18	94	TURKEY	-0.00
48	ISRAEL	-0.19	92	TRINIDAD	-0.02
115	BARBADOS	-0.21	90	THAILAND	-0.10
75	PERU	-0.22	73	PANAMA	-0.11
86	SPAIN	-0.25	7	BOLIVIA	-0.13
94	TURKEY	-0.28	51	JAMAICA	-0.22
22	COSTA RICA	-0.28	74	PARAGUAY	-0.22
24	CYPRUS	-0.30	56	LIBERIA	-0.27
56	LIBERIA	-0.33	30	EL SALVADOR	-0.27
19	COLOMBIA	-0.40	114	MALDIVE ISLANDS	-0.27
85	SOUTH AFRICA	-0.43	36	GREECE	-0.29

Table 16
(continuation)

NATIONAL ATTRIBUTE CANONICAL VARIATE SCORES			VOTING CANONICAL VARIATE SCORES		
3	ARGENTINA	-0.43	22	COSTA RICA	-0.30
92	TRINIDAD	-0.49	8	BRAZIL	-0.35
28	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	-0.51	101	URUGUAY	-0.39
51	JAMAICA	-0.69	68	NICARAGUA	-0.45
62	MEXICO	-0.81	86	SPAIN	-0.46
78	PORTUGAL	-0.95	78	PORTUGAL	-0.52
18	CHILE	-0.99	40	HONDURAS	-0.56
36	GREECE	-1.13	116	TAIWAN	-0.60
101	URUGUAY	-1.17	47	IRELAND	-1.23
47	IRELAND	-1.45	52	JAPAN	-1.32
5	AUSTRIA	-1.48	85	SOUTH AFRICA	-1.34
32	FINLAND	-1.61	33	FRANCE	-1.55
49	ICELAND	-1.67	32	FINLAND	-1.67
52	JAPAN	-1.64	42	ICELAND	-1.76
33	FRANCE	-1.66	88	SWEDEN	-1.86
42	ICELAND	-1.67	58	LUXEMBOURG	-1.86
6	BELGIUM	-1.85	98	UNITED KINGDOM	-1.91
67	NEW ZEALAND	-1.89	49	ITALY	-1.99
4	AUSTRALIA	-1.98	5	AUSTRIA	-1.99
99	UNITED STATES	-1.99	66	NETHERLANDS	-2.00
27	DENMARK	-2.05	27	DENMARK	-2.09
14	CANADA	-2.19	4	AUSTRALIA	-2.13
66	NETHERLANDS	-2.20	71	NORWAY	-2.16
58	LUXEMBOURG	-2.22	67	NEW ZEALAND	-2.25
88	SWEDEN	-2.25	6	BELGIUM	-2.25
98	UNITED KINGDOM	-2.38	14	CANADA	-2.42
71	NORWAY	-2.45	99	UNITED STATES	-2.67

TABLE 17
SUMMARY OF STUDIES

<u>Year</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Findings</u>
1. 1961-62	UN Caucusing Groups	Average Per Capita GNP of the members of caucusing groups predicts attitudes held by delegate members in groups, High Development predicts negative attitudes.
2. 1965-66	UN Delegate Attitudes Toward Organs	Economic Development predicts negative attitudes.
3. 1967-68	Relationship of Voting and Attitudes	Western Voting states have negative attitudes. Afro-Asian, African, and Communist voting states have positive attitudes.
4. 1967-68	UN Caucusing Groups	Economic Development predicts supranational structure and attitudes.
5. 1968	UN Attitudes	Economic Development receives largest weight in canonical correlation between attitudes and predictors, predicting negative attitudes.
6. 1969	Regional Groups	Economic Development discriminates 49 regional groups better than any other predictor, followed by Democracy and U.S. Relations.
7. 1970	Voting	Economic Development best predictor of negative voting, followed by Democracy and U.S. Relations.

APPENDIX A

VARIABLES AND SOURCES

1. Military Personnel as a Percentage of Total Population (1)
2. Population per 1,000 hectares of agricultural land (1)
3. Inhabitants per Physician (1)
4. Gross National Product (1)
5. Inhabitants per Hospital Bed (1)
6. Percentage of Labor Force Employed in Agriculture (1)
7. Annual Percentage Rate of Increase in Population (1)
8. Moslems as a Percentage of Population (1)
9. Roman Catholics as a Percentage of Total Population (1)
10. All Christians as a Percentage of Total Population (1)
11. Population per Square Kilometer (1)
12. Area in Square Kilometers (1)
13. Radios per 1,000 Population (1)
14. Defense Expenditures as a Percentage of Gross National Product (1)
15. Votes in National Elections as a Percentage of Voting Age Population (1)
16. Military Personnel as a Percentage of Population Age 15-64 (1)
17. Students enrolled in Higher Education per 100,000 Population (1)
18. Primary and Secondary School Pupils as a Percentage of Population Age 5-19 (1)
19. Percentage Literate of Population Age 15 and over (1)
20. Percentage Literate of Population Age 15 and over, Average Annual Increase (1)
21. Percentage Export of Total Exports to U.S. (3)
22. Percentage Imports of Total Imports from U.S. (3)
23. Number in Permanent Missions at the United Nations (4)
24. Year Entered the United Nations (5)
25. Military Alliances (9)
26. Imports from the United States (7)
27. Exports to the United States (7)
28. Exports to the U.S.S.R. (7)
29. Imports to the U.S.S.R. (7)
30. Exports to Communist China (7)
31. Imports from Communist China (7)
32. Population (2)
33. Urbanization (2)
34. Agricultural Population (2)
35. Per Capita Gross National Product (2)
36. International Financial Status (2)

37. Economic Development Status (2)
38. Freedom of the Press (2)
39. Newspaper Circulation per 1,000 Population (2)
40. Religious Homogeneity (2)
41. Racial Homogeneity (2)
42. Linguistic Homogeneity (2)
43. Date of Independence (2)
44. Westernization (2)
45. Political Modernization (2)
46. System Style (2)
47. Constitutional Status of Present Regime (2)
48. Governmental Stability (2)
49. Representative Character of Current Regime (2)
50. Current Electoral System (2)
51. Freedom of Group Opposition (2)
52. Political Inculturation (2)
53. Sectionalism (2)
54. Interest Articulation by Associational Groups (2)
55. Interest Articulation by Institutional Groups (2)
56. Interest Articulation by Non-Associational Groups (2)
57. Interest Articulation by Anomic Groups (2)
58. Interest Articulation by Political Parties (2)
59. Interest Aggregation by Executive (2)
60. Interest Aggregation by Legislature (2)
61. Stability of Party System (2)
62. Personalissimo (2)
63. Political Leadership (2)
64. Leadership Charisma (2)
65. Vertical Power Distribution
66. Horizontal Power Distribution (2)
67. Current Status of Legislature (2)
68. Character of Legislature (2)
69. Current Status of Executive (2)
70. Character of Bureaucracy (2)
71. Political Participation by Military (2)
72. Role of Police (2)
73. Communist Bloc (2)
74. Distance from U.S. (8)
75. Distance from U.S.S.R. (8)
76. Distance from China (8)
77. Military Strength (6)

APPENDIX B

23rd SESSION

01 Representation of China in the United Nations (2389)

"...whenever more than one authority claims to be the Government entitled to represent a Member State in the United Nations ... the question should be considered in the light of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the circumstances of each case."

"...(The United Nations) affirms again that this decision remains valid."

02 Question of Namibia (2403)

"Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence ... condemnation of Government of South Africa ... for its refusal to withdraw from Namibia and for its policy and actions designed to destroy national unity and territorial integrity."

03 Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States (2456-A)

"Endorses the Declaration of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States (held Aug-Sept. 1968), requests resolutions transmitted ... to international bodies concerned for careful consideration, (concerning) ... problems of achieving universal peace ... cessation of nuclear arms race, general and complete disarmament, etc."

04 Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States (2456-B)

"Reiterates the recommendations of Conference ... concerning the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and ... ratify ... Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America."

05 Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States (2456-C)

"Requests ... report on the establishment ... of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes ... to permit its consideration at 24th session of General Assembly."

06 Conferences of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States (2456-D)

"Urges the USSR and USA to enter at an early date into bilateral discussions on the limitation of offensive strategic nuclear weapon delivery systems and systems of defense against ballistic missiles."

07 The Korean question (2466)

"Calls for cooperation in easing tensions in the area, and requests the UN Committee for Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea ... continue to carry out tasks previously assigned to it."

08 Examination of the question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind (2467-A)

"Establishes a Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction ..."

"Instructs the Committee ... to study the elaboration of the legal principles and norms which would promote international co-operation in the exploration and use of the sea-bed ..."

09 Examination of the question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind (2467-C)

"Requests the Secretary-General to undertake a study on the question of establishing .. appropriate international machinery for the promotion of the exploration and exploitation of ... (the sea-bed and ocean floor)."

10 Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity (2391)

"Adopts and opens for signature, ratification and accession the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes ... which expressly condemned as crimes against humanity the violation of the economic and political rights of the indigenous population and the policies of apartheid ... effective punishment of war crimes and crimes against humanity is an important element in their prevention ... there is no period of limitation for war crimes."

11 Respect for and implementation of human rights in occupied territories (2443)

"Establish a committee ... to investigate Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the population in occupied territories."

12 Questions of Southern Rhodesia (2383)

"Reaffirms the right of the people to Zimbabwe to freedom and independence and the legitimacy of their struggle ... condemns

the failure and refusal of the Government of United Kingdom as administering power, to take effective measures to bring down the illegal racist minority regime in South Rhodesia and to transfer power ... to the people of Zimbabwe."

13 Question of Territories under Portuguese Administration (2395)

"Calls upon the Government of Portugal to apply without delay to the peoples of the territories under its domination the principles of self-determination, freedom and independence ... condemns the minority racist regime of South Africa ..."

14 Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations (2422)

"Approves the chapter of the report ... with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries ... regrets persistent refusal of United Kingdom and North Ireland to transmit information (Art. 73 of Charter) to government of South Rhodesia."

15 Question of Oman (2424)

"Calls upon Government of United Kingdom ... to implement fully resolution 1514 ... concerning them."

16 Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa (2425)

"Requests the administering Powers to take immediate measures to put an end to all practices which exploit the Territories and peoples under their administration and consequently violate the political, economic and social rights of the peoples."

17 Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (2426)

"Recommends that specialized agencies and international institutions concerned should assist peoples struggling for liberation from colonial rule and should work out ... concrete programs of assistance to ..."

18 Question of Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea (2427)

"Calls upon the administering Power to fix an early date for self-determination and independence ... hold free elections ..."

to transfer effective power to the representatives of the people of the Territories."

19 Question of Ifni and Spanish Sahara (2428)

"Requests administering power to take immediately the necessary steps to accelerate the decolonization of Ifni ... invites the administering power to determine ... the procedures for the holding of a referendum under UN ... enabling the indigenous population of the territory (Spanish Sahara) to exercise freely its right to self-determination."

20 Question of Gibraltar (2429)

"Requests the administering Power to terminate the colonial situation in Gibraltar."

21 Question of American Samoa, Antigua, Bahamas, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Cocos (Keeling) Islands, Dominica, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Guam, Montserrat, New Hebrides, Niue, Pitcairn, St. Helena, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Tokelau Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands and the United States Virgin Islands (2430)

"Urges the administering powers to allow UN visiting groups to visit the Territories and to extend to them full cooperation ... decides that UN should render all help to the peoples of these territories in their efforts freely to decide their future status."

22 United Nations Training and Educational Programme (2431)

"Convinced that the provision of assistance for education and training of persons from Territories concerned is essential and therefore is desirable to strengthen and expand the Programme."

23 Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency (2474-A)

"Recommends that the specialized agencies which apply methods of assessment similar to those of the United Nations ... should intensify their efforts with a view to bringing their scales into harmony with UN scale."

24 The question of including Russian among the working languages of the United Nations (2479)

"Decides to include Russian among the working languages of the General Assembly .. include Russian and Spanish among the working languages of the Security Council."

25 Composition of the Secretariat (2480-B)

"From 1 Jan. 1970 the acceptable minimum requirement at the moment of recruitment will be the ability to use of the working languages of the Secretariat ... from 1 Jan. 1972 all promotions from one grade to another ... for staff in the professional category will be conditional upon ... knowledge of a second language."

24th SESSION

01 Celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations (2499-B)

"Considering that a special issue of the United Nations stamps has been decided upon ... with the words 'Peace and progress' as the theme on the occasion of the (twenty-fifth) anniversary ... decides that medals ... be struck ... and stamps ... be issued ..."

02 Representaion of China in the United Nations (2500)

"Recalling the recommendation contained in its resolution 396 (V) of 14 December 1950 that, whenever more than one authority claims to be the Government entitled to represent a Member State in the United Nations and this question becomes the subject of controversy in the United Nations, the question should be considered in the light of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the circumstances of each case."

03 Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian) (2504)

"Recalling its resolution 1752 of 21 September 1962, ... the Government of Indonesia, in implementing its national development plan, is giving special attention to the progress of West New Guinea, ... and the government of the Netherlands, in close cooperation with the government of Indonesia will continue to render financial assistance ..."

04 Manifesto on Southern Africa (2505)

"Convinced of the need for intensifying international efforts for elimination of Apartheid, racial discrimination and colonialism, ... the UN ... welcomes the Manifesto of South Africa and recommends it to attention of all Peoples and States."

- 05 Special programme of activities in connexion with the tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. (2521)

"Need on the occasion of that anniversary to evaluate the progress so far made ... to formulate specific proposal for the elimination of the remaining manifestations of colonialism ... endorses ... the programme of activities to be undertaken in connection with the 10th anniversary of the Declaration."

- 06 Question of Korea (2516)

"Encourage the exercise of restraint and the easing of tensions in the area, and to secure maximum support, assistance and cooperation in the realization of the peaceful reunification of Korea."

- 07 Question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interest of mankind (2574-D)

"Declares that States and persons, physical or juridical, are bound to refrain all activities or exploitation of the resources of the area of the sea-bed, ocean floor ... beyond the limits of national jurisdiction."

- 08 Question of general and complete disarmament (2602-E)

"Reaffirming its resolution ... that the question of general and complete disarmament was the most important one facing the world today ... declares the Decade of the 1970's as a Disarmament Decade ... (and) Requests the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to resume its work as early as possible, bearing in mind that the ultimate goal is general and complete disarmament."

- 09 Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons (2603-A)

"Declares as contrary to the ... rules of international law ... any chemical agents of warfare ... any biological agents of warfare ... calls anew for strict observance of Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed 1925."

- 10 Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States (2605-A)

"Aware of the potential contribution that atomic energy will make in fostering technology and economic progress throughout the world, ... invites the International Atomic Energy Agency, etc. to take further appropriate action on the recommendations of the Non-Nuclear-Weapon States in planning and carrying out their activities."

25 Composition of the Secretariat (2480-B)

"From 1 Jan. 1970 the acceptable minimum requirement at the moment of recruitment will be the ability to use of the working languages of the Secretariat ... from 1 Jan. 1972 all promotions from one grade to another ... for staff in the professional category will be conditional upon ... knowledge of a second language."

24th SESSION

01 Celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations (2499-B)

"Considering that a special issue of the United Nations stamps has been decided upon ... with the words 'Peace and progress' as the theme on the occasion of the (twenty-fifth) anniversary ... decides that medals ... be struck ... and stamps ... be issued ..."

02 Representaion of China in the United Nations (2500)

"Recalling the recommendation contained in its resolution 396 (V) of 14 December 1950 that, whenever more than one authority claims to be the Government entitled to represent a Member State in the United Nations and this question becomes the subject of controversy in the United Nations, the question should be considered in the light of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the circumstances of each case."

03 Agreement between the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands concerning West New Guinea (West Irian) (2504)

"Recalling its resolution 1752 of 21 September 1962, ... the Government of Indonesia, in implementing its national development plan, is giving special attention to the progress of West New Guinea, ... and the government of the Netherlands, in close cooperation with the government of Indonesia will continue to render financial assistance ..."

04 Manifesto on Southern Africa (2505)

"Convinced of the need for intensifying international efforts for elimination of Apartheid, racial discrimination and colonialism, ... the UN ... welcomes the Manifesto of South Africa and recommends it to attention of all Peoples and States."

- 05 Special programme of activities in connexion with the tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. (2521)

"Need on the occasion of that anniversary to evaluate the progress so far made ... to formulate specific proposal for the elimination of the remaining manifestations of colonialism ... endorses ... the programme of activities to be undertaken in connection with the 10th anniversary of the Declaration."

- 06 Question of Korea (2516)

"Encourage the exercise of restraint and the easing of tensions in the area, and to secure maximum support, assistance and cooperation in the realization of the peaceful reunification of Korea."

- 07 Question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interest of mankind (2574-D)

"Declares that States and persons, physical or juridical, are bound to refrain all activities or exploitation of the resources of the area of the sea-bed, ocean floor ... beyond the limits of national jurisdiction."

- 08 Question of general and complete disarmament (2602-E)

"Reaffirming its resolution ... that the question of general and complete disarmament was the most important one facing the world today ... declares the Decade of the 1970's as a Disarmament Decade ... (and) Requests the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to resume its work as early as possible, bearing in mind that the ultimate goal is general and complete disarmament."

- 09 Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons (2603-A)

"Declares as contrary to the ... rules of international law ... any chemical agents of warfare ... any biological agents of warfare ... calls anew for strict observance of Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed 1925."

- 10 Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States (2605-A)

"Aware of the potential contribution that atomic energy will make in fostering technology and economic progress throughout the world, ... invites the International Atomic Energy Agency, etc. to take further appropriate action on the recommendations of the Non-Nuclear-Weapon States in planning and carrying out their activities."

- 11 Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States (2605-B)

"Take steps to assure the widest exchange of information ... benefits that may be derived from peaceful nuclear explosions ... convening of further technical meetings to discuss the scientific and technological aspects of this technology."
- 12 United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (2535-B)

"Palestine Arab Refugees ... denial of their inalienable rights ... aggravated by reported acts of collective punishment etc. ... calling upon the government of Israel to take effective and immediate steps for the return without delay of those inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities."
- 13 United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (2535-C)

"Continue to provide humanitarian assistance ... on an emergency basis ... persons who are at present displaced and in serious need of continued assistance ... appeals for generous contributions."
- 14 Regular programme of technical assistance for industrial development (2511)

"Maintain and strengthen the role of the Industrial Development Board in respect of action in the field of industrial development ... maintain separate section of UN budget for needs of technical assistance."
- 15 Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (2578)

"Suggests a special international conference of United Nations Industrial Development Organization be held ... to formulate its provisional agenda and its basic objectives."
- 16 Respect for and implementation of human rights in occupied territories (2546)

"Urgently calls upon the government of Israel to desist forthwith from its reported repressive practices and policies towards the civilian population in the occupied territories and to comply with obligations ... under Universal Declaration of Human Rights."
- 17 Commission on the Status of Women (2587)

"Achievement of its (the Commission on the Status of Women) aims demands a sustained effort and urges the Economic and Social Council to reconsider its decision ... so that the Commission may continue to meet."

- 18 Implementation of the recommendations of the International Conference on Human Rights (2588-A)

"United Nations hopes that the measures and activities undertaken on the occasion of the International Year for Human Rights by Governments will continue to develop and enlarge."

- 19 Implementation of the recommendations of the International Conference on Human Rights (2588-B)

"Reaffirms the right of all peoples under Colonial and Foreign rule to liberation and self determination ... Supports the liberation movements in South Africa ... for freedom and independence."

- 20 Creation of the post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (2595)

"Decides to give the highest priority to the consideration of post of United Nations Commissioner of Human Rights during its twenty-fifth session."

- 21 Question of Namibia (2498)

"Reaffirms the rights of people of Namibia to self determination and independence, and condemns the government of South Africa for its refusal to withdraw from Namibia."

- 22 Question of Territories under Portuguese administration (2507)

"Condemns Portugal and South Africa for economic and political violations in Africa ... reaffirms the legitimacy of the struggle by the People of those Territories for independence and freedom."

- 23 Question of Southern Rhodesia (2508)

"Reaffirms the rights, freedom and independence of the people of Zimbabwe, and condemns Great Britain and N. Ireland for not taking effective measures to bring down the illegal racist minority regime. Also condemns the governments of South Africa and Portugal who have relations with South Rhodesia, and provides for sanctions for all nations against South Rhodesia, South Africa, and Portugal."

- 24 Question of Namibia (2517)

"Condemns the government of South Africa for its refusal to withdraw from Namibia, and reaffirms the rights of people of Namibia to self determination and independence."

- 25 Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and Territories under Portuguese domination and in all other Territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa (2554)
- "Activities of foreign economic and other interest which are impeding the implementation of the declaration of the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples in Rhodesia, Namibia and territories under Portuguese domination and in all other territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in South Africa, and condemns those governments who fail to comply with the above."
- 26 Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (2555)
- "Recommends that the specialized agencies ... should take measures ... to increase scope of their assistance ... to the peoples struggling to liberate themselves from colonial rule."
- 27 Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 of the Charter of the United Nations (2558)
- "Condemns the government of Portugal for its refusal to transmit information under Article 73, United Nations Charter, and deeply deplores the refusal of Great Britain and North Ireland to transmit information on Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, and St. Lucia."
- 28 Question of Oman (2559)
- "Reaffirms the rights of the people of Oman to self determination and deplores the refusal of Great Britain and North Ireland to implement the relevant general assembly resolutions concerning territories."
- 29 Question of Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea (2590)
- "Reaffirms the rights of the people of Papua and the trust territory of New Guinea to self-determination and independence."
- 30 Question of Spanish Sahara (2591)
- "Reaffirms the rights of the people of Spanish Sahara to self-determination and requests the administering power to hold a referendum under United Nations auspices."

- 31 Question of American Samoa, Antigua, Bahamas, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Brunei, Cayman Islands, Cocos (Keeling) Islands, Dominica, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Guam, Montserrat, New Hebrides, Niue, Pitcairn, St. Helena, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Tokelau Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands, and the United States Virgin Islands (2592)

"Reaffirms the rights of the people of the following territories to self-determination and independence: American Samoa, Antigua, Bahamas, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Brunei, Cayman Islands, Cocos (Keeling) Islands, Dominica, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Guam, Montserrat, New Hebrides, Niue, Pitcairn, St. Helena, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Tokelau Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands, and the United States Virgin Islands."

- 32 Question of Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia and St. Vincent (2593)

"Requests declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, including Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia and St. Vincent."

- 33 Study of the nature of the increases in the level of expenditure in the United Nations regular budget (2617)

"Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly, at its twenty-fifth session, an economic and financial analysis of the nature of the increase in the activities, staff and budget of the United Nations."